CROZER QUARTERLY

Volume XXII APRIL, 1945 Number 2

I TAKE MY LIFE IN MY HANDS

ANONYMOUS

I TAKE my life in my hands—to give it patient, pertinent, and personal review.

It is said that one of the pet idiosyncrasies of the great Wagner was to stand in front of a mirror and tip his hat to himself. I commend the gesture. Keen, intimate, and exacting awareness of one's self need not be the demoralizing experience modern escapists and extroverts insinuate. A moderation of engagement will make most unlikely an attack of either immedicable morbidity or incorrigible ostentation. Self-judgment is a superior art, and he is in no sense wise whose modesty gainsays its culture. The sacred injunction against thinking of ourselves more highly than we ought to think puts no convincing restraint upon this profitable discipline of self-consultation and self-knowledge. We may smile at the vanity of Sir Oracle in *The Merchant of Venice,* "I am Sir Oracle, and when I ope my lips let no dog bark," but we need nevertheless the good fruitage of a searching candor and a wholesome self-appraisal if life is to maintain its integrity.

There is here, admittedly, the suggestion of the First Person Singular. In which, I confess to no ordinary satisfaction. For I am and always have been no little interested in myself. What I am and what I clearly am not, what I should have been and what I may yet become and what I shall never be are all primary concerns of my most thoughtful hours. The very fact that my world has for me its centre in myself gives my world meaning. And the very intensity of that consciousness of personal privilege and personal responsibility is the gauge of life's real meaning as I have found it. The unconditional genuineness with which I take my life in my hands and evaluate it, reckless of comfort or discomfort, accepting the disciplines without excitement, I count to be one of my finest achieved distinctions of character. Happy is the man who is not afraid of self-scrutiny. Happier yet the man who counts the experiences of self-judgment the most corrective and creative glories of his life. I, too, stand before the mirror, and I, too, tip my hat to myself.

And I have a profound conviction that the Eternal God shares my enthusiasm. I doubt whether I have ever been more conscious of his abid-

ing nearness than in these vigorous and eager submissions of myself to my best judgment. Quite reverently I inquire if our Lord himself may not have had such self-scrutiny in mind when he declared that "Blessed are the pure in heart." In any case, I would have us take seriously the intimacy of our public emphases and our private conclusions. What does it do to us as preachers of the word to be forever proclaiming that the nature of God is best understood in his impassioned devotion to human personality, and then by some smug self-erasure to fail to recognize that if that is true in general principle, it is more tellingly true in specific particular? For long years I was thrilled with the proclamation of the divine premium on the sanctity of man; but one day I read the simple suggestion of Jesus, ". . . two sparrows are sold for a penny, but not one of them shall fall to the ground without your Father," and forthwith I experienced an incomparable ecstasy. My faith as to God's care for the soul of man had suddenly become also my faith as to God's care for ME. From that hour I have felt the riches of God's love, as a general principle *and* as a first person singular specific.

With this clear as a spiritual premise, we may proceed. Surely no one will advise a more comely humility in the light of that premise. The self-judgment which is here commended cannot possibly lead to presumption or arrogance. That comes of the effort to convince people of what we really are *not;* this that I commend takes place in the closed closet where a man waits a while alone and revels in the thoroughgoing disciplines of self-communion. Condemnation and honor, disturbance and pleasure, violence and peace follow one another with engaging rapidity, and the result is an increased zest for being, and a joy in kinship with the Eternal.

In such a spirit, and with such an understanding of an experience held choicely choice, I venture to tell you quite frankly some of the things *I* find when I take my life thus in my hands or when I stand for a thoughtful moment and tip my hat to myself.

First, in the realm of my living religious faith: I am conscious of the attendant God. I believe many things about him but none more ardently than these two, first, that he is beyond the shadow of a doubt capable of vindicating himself as absolutely adequate to all the needs of mankind, and that none need fear that he will faint or be weary whatever the chal lenge of time may be; second, that he is now operative as a self-expending, saving spirit to a magnificent degree, especially in those preliminary and basic glories of "things not seen but eternal." These two convictions as to the prevalence of the Divine provide me with a sense of spiritual security and compulsion sufficient for my soul, and—in my enthusiastic judgment—for all mankind.

In the second place—illustrated at some length, if you please—I find in myself a nurtured worthiness which I shall call by the simple designation, "a superior delight in my fellow man." On several occasions during the past five years I have made rather extensive studies of my interests and of my investments of time, and I have been positively amazed at the fact that my life has been so very largely involved in the minds and hearts and lives of others. Now let me hasten to guard myself against an inordinate self-appreciation in this respect as though I were in any sense different from my brethren. And let me insist that I am often painfully conscious that I deliberately walk along the other side of the street when I see ugliness in my path. I hold no record for a love of the unlovely. I can be quite as keen as any to choose the cordial and concurrent for my companionship. I have known the stab of remorse at having arranged some temporary shelter for my spirit while some whom I might have succored became embittered at the general heartlessness. Nor have the sophistications of our modern age been able to shield me from the reproach of my own conscience when I have permitted an otherwise alert imagination to go stagnant for personal convenience. Of such I can speak at length with a sincere humility. And yet, withal, I tip my hat to myself for what I have come to regard as one of my life's most saving graces, a consummate delight in my fellow man and a passionate anxiety that it may always be well with him.

I said I would be specific. Many people today suffer from the turbulence of our present order. They cry out in their distresses, often with the eloquence of an anguish which they have sincerely sought to hide. No minister has to hunt for an opportunity to listen gently to the bewildered and fearful. I find myself seldom wearied with these recitals, although it be true that they all follow pretty much of a pattern. It is no professional acumen that has made of me a painstaking friend, no wisdom as to the efficacy of such in a successful pastorate. From an exceedingly shy youngster in a far corner of the world's ordinariness, I have been thrown in a few short years into the company of the significant and sufficient, and they too have turned to me and I have pretty much lost my early aversion to folks in my glad service to folks. But it has all just developed as incidental to career and opportunity, unthought, unplanned. A providential leading, it may be! In the final Book of the Record of Life there may be written beneath my name column after column of effective human graciousness. It is not to boast or be daringly irreverent. It is to indicate the truth that my influence as a Christian has never risen higher than in the expression of genuine interest in the welfare of others and in the sincere attempt to do something in keeping with that interest. For nearly twenty years now I have had the engaging delight of ministering to a grand

people in the heart of a great city. I am very sure that most of the things which I have emphasized by persuasive word have had but temporary lodgment. But I know that some have built their faith in the goodness of mankind and God around the fact of my untiring devotion to the good of those who have needed me.

May I be so indelicate as to be even more specific? I am one of those to whom more than thirty years of ministry have brought no ease of mood or procedure in the conduct of the services for the dead and those stricken in sorrow. The fact is that from the moment I share the shocking news of a broken family circle until days later I return from the last rites for the honored departed I am torn with an inner anguish as to whether I may by some chance have been of any real use. And yet, unless I greatly misjudge the apparent sincerity of the good people with whom my lot has been cast, there is not another single item in the program of my Christian ministry that has been so consistently helpful. My wise readers will, of course, suggest that the reason is not far to seek, for such inner fearsomeness usually begets spiritual aptitude. But be that as it may, the record stands. I find myself a friend in need, a friend indeed.

Another delight in people's good: my habit of later years of personal correspondence. I write literally thousands of letters every year by my own hand. For instance, year after year I send personal birthday greetings to hundreds, with ever an effort to be personal and say the little special thing which fits none other. I am sure that I would have long since given this up, had it not been for the joy of intimate identification with others. I have long had a Good Friday afternoon spiritual indulgence which has done me great personal good. Following the impressive musical service which has been a time-honored ministry at our church, I go my way alone for hours. In my aloneness I write long and carefully devoted letters to the three or four people anywhere in the world who have come to my mind as most needing my spiritual company that day. It has often been directed to some distant relative or friend who has borne with fortitude some ravagingly incurable disease or undergone some exacting operation. Often it has gone to some brother minister who probably has not heard from me in a very long time but to whom on that day I may be able to bring an extraordinary bit of assurance by moving in at his side for a while.

And but one more illustration for the encouragement of my younger friends, less seasoned by the "burning of the noontide heat and the burden of the day": I have not yet been able to protect myself from my friends. Sometimes we may carelessly resent the interferences and intrusions of those who like to drop by and have a word. Admitting for the moment that some do want to see us at the most ungodly times, let us rather be

glad that they count seeing us that important! The theory is, of course, that a good management of our availability would reflect itself in our public poise and in the increased impressiveness of our better prepared utterances. Possibly! But in this, as in a number of other concerns, upon my very peculiarities depends my salvation. I have been blessed as few others with a mind the alertness of which is seldom questioned; particularly, that alertness which finds it quite easy to make rapid readjustments which immediately completely belie the evidence of the situation of a few seconds gone. By this favor, for which I am personally but little responsible, a constitutional equipment, I find myself "in the spirit on the Lord's day" without extravagant resort to vacuum security. In fact, I have often found a bit of a brush with one of the saints just previous to entering the pulpit a godly stimulative.

To sum up, I find myself happy among people and distinctly honored by their apparent general keenness to sit where I sit. And finding this as true, I tip my hat to myself. It brings a bit of color to my cheek. I think I am the better for it. And I speak of it utterly unashamed.

A third major impression I have received from a searching study of myself, and one that heartens me no end, is that I am still very much alive to life and the world I live in, and that I have learned a number of unquestionably wise things along the years. My chief satisfaction is in the consciousness that the exceedingly full years of a strenuous ministry have not worn me down to a place where I cannot repeat some of my earlier audacities. The tendency among men who have held down a job for a considerable period of time is to coast on accumulated good will during the later years and, coasting, to lose the capacity of fresh attack. I have had occasion during recent months to look very thoroughly into the question as to whether I had the mind and heart and will to engage myself to some new adventure as I was once so keen to do. I had to ask myself as to whether I had the spiritual sturdiness to stand up to the ravages of accepting of necessity compromise alternatives and submitting to lesser goods with which others seemed to be satisfied—and all this without excitement or resentment. I had to look deep down and ask whether I could risk the cynicism of those who knew the project would fail in my assurance that it would give them the lie. All these were spiritual concomitants of my earlier years of rebuilding ruined churches, raising emergency monies, challenging cantankerous complacencies. And I found that I was not afraid to try it again. And finding that was heartening, to put it mildly. I said to my soul: "Thou *livest.*" And my heart took courage.

As to the wisdom which the years have brought, I confess that the expression of it seems very tame when compared to the fact. Put in words,

these homely conclusions of mine sound very ordinary, perhaps immaterial. But I assure you they are weighted with the clinging earth of fertilizing experience. I would that I might transplant them to others of earnest mold with that clinging earth unshaken from their roots.

One thing I have pretty much concluded from the days of my years is this: Few human achievements are more worthy than that of a maintained balance. I have again and again taxed my mental and spiritual equipment to the limit in a desperate attempt to forbid myself an unseemly excitement in a time of general crisis. Again and again I have drawn my fairly ready imagination out to a very thin thread in a serious effort to anticipate the evil thing before it could get out of hand and to frustrate it a-borning. Time was when my good wife quite honestly declared that if there were nothing wrong to be headed off, I would restlessly insist upon inventing some worry or fear. But I count it all of great importance in keeping the premium where it belonged—a constant care for the good, a jealousy lest the evil abound, and a relentless effort in manœuvering to make impossible the thing I had feared. Such an investment in the maintenance of balance has paid gold. The cynical reference of some to denominational politics may well be checked by the history of imaginative and creative endeavour of this sort. I am personally proud of every effective piece of undercover, anticipatory adjustment in which, in such a mind, I have ever engaged.

Along the same line and closely related has been my personal persuasion that no one or no thing can ever hurt you permanently if it is unworthy of you. I used to spend a lot of time explaining. Now I just call attention to the fact that I am still the resident minister of a time-honored fellowship.

Another conclusion that has set my feet toward happiness is that he who accepts gracious appreciation with real restraint need never be overwhelmed by the ungracious criticism of those less kind. One of the time-honored complaints against me among my best friends has been put in this fashion: "Our minister won't stand still and listen when you try to tell him how much you liked what he did." Well, one Sunday I got up in the pulpit and told them why: "Because if I never heed too keenly what is so kindly said, I am not depressed overmuch by what is said unkindly." I said that this was a simple wisdom. True! But you can live longer by it!

And yet one more of these personal truths: The quicker you realize that you live in an accountable universe and that you get very little without cause, the quicker you become a man to whom work is more than a necessary compulsion. For you, then, work becomes a satisfying joy. Weariness of body and exhaustion of spirit are often the occasion for a glee of heart that is far from hysterical. They are for you the badge of

distinction. They certify that you have accepted a man's part in the scheme of things, and with this that you have arrived indeed.

And finally, a general observation which, I trust, will commend itself. I find when I take my life in my hands to give it patient, pertinent, and personal judgment, that to no small degree the worthiness stems from God's good grace in having provided me with a continuing succession of spiritual opportunities. Space and more space has been my boon. My every move has been inspired by the assurance that leaving here and going there the days ahead were cordial and commanding. I should forever thank God that I was led to come to America, for this is "my story" in this "good land": Ever a challenging and inviting future.

I do not wish to close upon a note of ill will or discontent. But in this thing for which I am so devoutly proud I have my present misgivings and fears. I know that we are going through a terrific revolution in American life and genius as well as in the world at large. In my best moments I am sure that it will all work out to the general good and the glory of God. But my one complaint—and it is a genuine one with deep and surging implications—is that we shall so change America and the world into *inter*dependence that the sons of men in generations to come will never have the glory I have known, the glory of responding with one's all to inviting opportunity. By this I mean much more than free enterprise and rugged individualism. I mean that holy adventure in amplitude which seems to be so necessary to the wholesome growth of man's spirit and the notable establishment of man's best good.

Possibly, in the good purposes of God, another sort of America than that in which I have been blessed will be of similar challenge and value to that which I have prized. I must not be too fearful of the future. I shall not. I shall only speak my honest hope that the spiritual bounties of tomorrow may be as choice as those of yesterday and that my sons and yours may move up to their sixties with a comparable gratitude.

In this effort to see myself as I am, with neither inordinate presumption nor enervating pessimism, I have again experienced a pleasant discipline in personal devotion to the best. I have once again come upon the reverent recognition that all my life I have been the creature of a friendly universe and a most gracious God. I have not written to call undue attention to my personal characteristics and convictions, but I have written to encourage those of similar or cordial mind that the authoritarianism of spiritual experience far surpasses that of serious argumentation when it comes to the persuasion of life toward the Eternal God. Thus self-consultation achieves a true dignity in a genuine self-consecration. I take my life in my hands, I trust, profitably. I tip my hat to myself. And I still commend the gesture.

THE EFFECTS OF ACCELERATION ON THE FACULTY

JOHN M. FOGG, JR.
University of Pennsylvania

SHORTLY after Pearl Harbor administrative officers in institutions of higher education throughout the country began to consider the formulation of programs of acceleration designed to expedite the progress toward the degree of male undergraduate and professional students. The result of this early planning has been that for more than three years the great majority of colleges and universities in the United States have operated on a calendar which provides a year-round schedule of classes with the elimination of the traditional long summer recess.

In some institutions this has been accomplished by utilizing all four quarters for instruction; in others three terms or "trimesters" of fifteen of sixteen weeks duration have been offered; still others have experimented with some combination of the normal fall and spring semesters, supplemented by a protracted summer term. In nearly all cases the objective has been achieved by compulsory attendance over a twelve months period, with the intervals between terms or divisions reduced to the minimum required for the functioning of administrative machinery. Students and faculty alike have been committed to this schedule since the summer of 1942, and education, like other essential industries, has voluntarily geared itself to the exigencies of total warfare.

That this plan of educational acceleration has performed a real and important service is admitted even by its severest critics. The fact that it has permitted students to complete the four-year college program in from two and a half to two and two-thirds years means that thousands of young men have been able to fulfill the requirements for their degrees before being taken into military service. Thousands more have completed an appreciably larger portion of their educational program than would otherwise have been the case. Because entering classes have been accepted three or four times a year, instead of only once or twice, high school graduates have found it possible to embark upon their college careers with but little if any loss of time. Since most professional schools have also operated on an accelerated basis, a corresponding saving of time has been effected in the training of doctors, dentists, veterinarians, engineers, lawyers, and specialists in a variety of other fields.

While all of this has been accomplished with what most college authorities are pleased to call "no lowering of academic standards," it may be seriously questioned whether the educational output of such a

procedure can be compared favorably with that achieved in the more normal pattern of an eight or nine months college year followed by a summer vacation.

Doubtless many students have covered the same ground which they would have done under the traditional college program, but it may be questioned whether the material thus absorbed has been assimilated or seen with anything like the perspective which is gained in a more leisurely program. Probably everyone will agree that education is more than merely a learning process but that to be effective it must be a maturing process as well. The results of acceleration may in a sense be compared to those accomplished by cramming for examinations. A considerable amount of information has been imbibed at an intensive pace, with the inevitable result that much that has been learned will not be retained or that those facts which are retained may belong to the superficial rather than the fundamental category.

It is, however, not the purpose of this article to inquire deeply into the validity of acceleration as an educational procedure, nor even to defend those reasons which certain institutions may feel will make it necessary for them to continue acceleration after the war. These remarks are directed rather to calling attention to the significant effects which three years of acceleration have exerted upon our faculties, for although much has been written concerning the impact of acceleration upon our students, comparatively little has been said concerning its effects upon the members of our teaching staffs.

The first and most important result of a continuing program of acceleration is its influence on the health of individual members of the faculty. There can be no doubt that the physical well-being of all age groups has been significantly affected by a year-round teaching program, often with heavier loads than those normally carried. This has been most noticeable in the case of many of the older men, but must be acknowledged as applying in some measure to all age groups.

Many men who have come to rely upon the summer season as a period in which to build up their reserves of energy and resistance have carried full schedules for the last three summers, frequently under trying weather conditions. That this has been done willingly and with little complaint is a tribute to the splendid spirit of coöperation exhibited on all sides in a time of emergency. That it has reacted to the detriment of our most important asset, an efficient teaching staff, cannot be ignored.

In many institutions there has been evidenced a general lowering of morale among the faculty. Some men admit to being tired and lacking in resistance to various indispositions. A number have been hospitalized because of ailments brought about or aggravated by the additional strain

resulting from year-round participation in a strenuous academic program. Several deaths have occurred which, while not, perhaps, directly attributable to acceleration, may very probably have been hastened by continued adherence to a schedule in which the longest vacation has been the week between terms.

Although few statistics may be available to support the general conclusion, it can nevertheless scarcely be doubted that the physical well-being of our teaching staffs has been materially impaired as a result of acceleration, and that serious consideration should be devoted to any plan which will promise amelioration of the existing situation.

In this connection it may not be superfluous to point out that the life of the average college teacher is far from being the sinecure which, in the eyes of the layman, it sometimes appears to be. While it is true that full professors in many institutions may teach only eight or ten hours a week, it should be borne in mind that the conscientious and effective teacher may labor for an equally long, if not longer, time in preparation for those hours which he actually spends in the classroom. Add to this the fact that there will be papers to mark, drawings to correct, or laboratory reports to grade, and the number of required hours is materially increased. Furthermore, in most institutions it is expected of members of the faculty that they make original contributions in fields of investigation or scholarly research. Also, a teacher who is on the front line of scholarly work in any field will inevitably attract to him advanced or graduate students whose studies or dissertations he will be expected to supervise. Finally, one must not lose sight of the fact that in many colleges and universities there is a considerable amount of committee work and that a faculty member who possesses judgment and experience will undoubtedly be called upon to spend a number of hours each week in conference.

While it may, perhaps, be argued that the rôle of the college teacher as outlined above is no more onerous than that of the average businessman, there are other and more important considerations which require that if he is to continue to function effectively he should be endowed with a certain amount of leisure time. As already mentioned, one of the normal functions of a member of a college faculty is research. While it is true that certain types of scholarly work can be conducted by spending occasional brief spells in the laboratory or library, it is more often a fact that original research requires concentration and continued application. In certain fields of work there can be no substitute for the long summer "vacation" spent by the biologist at the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, by the historian at the British Museum, or by the anthropologist in the field. These examples may be multiplied indefinitely, but

the fact remains that a significant volume of research output is the result of such an investment in time and energy. When it becomes possible to look back over the period during which colleges operated on an accelerated basis, one result which will doubtless be apparent will be the greatly reduced bulk of research publication. While it is true that many universities have lost some of their best research men to military service or government agencies, it is still undeniable that those who have remained on the campus have been prevented from carrying out their normal research programs due to the exigencies of acceleration.

Another and less tangible effect on members of our college teaching staffs concerns their inability under the strain of acceleration to keep abreast of their own fields of study and teaching. Certainly no teacher who entertains a serious conception of his task will be content to teach the same course in the same way year after year. This may be less true of elementary courses than of advanced or graduate ones, but it should in a very definite way be characteristic of all courses. It may be more applicable to certain scientific subjects than in the fields of the humanities, but even in the latter there are shifting emphases and realignments of old interpretations. In other words, there is no discipline which is not being constantly informed by new materials, however static that field may traditionally have been considered. The good teacher should, therefore, not only contribute to his own discipline but must of necessity keep constantly aware of the contributions which others are making. He must have time for the perusal of periodicals in his own and allied fields. He should be able to attend conferences or scholarly meetings at which he and his colleagues in other universities discuss their joint problems. All of this has been largely impossible under acceleration, or at least in anything like the degree in which it is normally practiced. The few individuals who have been able to carry on a normal academic and scholarly life have probably done so at the sacrifice of their own physical resources.

It is perhaps not too soon to consider just what steps might be taken to improve the present situation. This becomes all the more necessary when it is realized that many institutions of higher learning have already announced their intention of continuing acceleration for a varying number of years after the war. The reasons which have resulted in this decision will perhaps vary with different colleges, but in general they revolve about the needs of the returning serviceman, and since they have been elaborated by many writers, there seems no reason to discuss them here.

It should be emphasized, however, that whether or not an institution continues to accelerate, the need for effective teaching will now be greater than ever before. The returning veteran will require sympathetic and perhaps individual attention. New educational alignments have already

been indicated. Existing curricula may have to be re-examined and perhaps adjusted to meet shifting emphases. The need for "refresher" and "trailer" courses has been widely publicized. The fact that much of this will devolve upon the faculty is a convincing argument for the existence of a teaching staff endowed with energy, patience, and sufficient leisure to enable it again to function in a normal manner. Since such a result can hardly be achieved under the present stress of acceleration, every attention should be given to the possibility of relieving the tension.

In those institutions traditionally dedicated to the quarter system, it may now be possible to return to the practice of allowing a faculty member to be off for one three-month period during each year. This has normally been possible only for the summer period, especially in those colleges in which the summer quarter corresponds to a summer school with a significantly different complexion as to teaching staff and student attendance. It should now be extended to the other quarters by establishing a system of rotation which would permit approximately one fourth of the faculty to be at liberty during each of the four quarters.

Although admittedly more difficult of implementation, the same principle may be extended to those institutions which are on the three-term basis. Here, as teachers on leave of absence in military service or with governmental agencies return, it should be possible to work out a carefully integrated schedule which will result in relieving the teaching assignments of all concerned.

Another matter which seems worthy of exploration is the shortening of the summer term. While many colleges feel that it will be a long time before the long summer vacation can be restored (some, in fact, openly doubt that it should ever be), there may be real wisdom in reducing it from sixteen weeks to twelve or even ten. This would result in a respite of at least a month, which would doubtless pay dividends in the form of increased vigor and enthusiasm on the part of both faculty and students.

It is, of course, trite to say that the prestige of any college or university is commensurate with the quality of its faculty. Since this is so, no problem of the many which the future of education holds is more vital than that of assuring the continued effectiveness of our teaching personnel.

THE RELIGION OF THE ROMANS

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE
University of Pennsylvania

In the history of religions that of Rome cannot be said to have been a great one, although with the help of alien elements, such as Greek philosophies and cults and Near Eastern mystery religions, it satisfied the limited spiritual needs of one of the greatest of peoples for more than a millennium. It shared with its sister religion of Greece, since Romans and Greeks had a common Indo-European heritage, many features. Thus, it had no founder, reformer, nor inspired teacher, no initial revelation, no sacred books and little ethical content. Similarly, it had no creeds nor dogmas, and so was more a matter of practice than of belief. Its priests, evolved out of the prehistoric medicine man and vendor of magic, were not hereditary and gave neither instruction nor exhortation, but merely performed the agelong rituals of various shrines in honor of deities and human events. The gods only gradually became recognized as persons and only in later times were believed to care for mortals. They differed only a little from men, their human character being shown by early ancestor worship and the later deification of mortals. It also showed differences from Greek religion: the Roman gods were conceived as abstract powers of nature which could influence men for good through the action of the *ius divinum*, while the Greek gods were full of individual life and activity. Again, the Roman gods were not clothed with poetic imagination, and Roman worship had little of the beauty and joyousness of Greek, and little of the latter's greatest characteristic, freedom from fear. And Roman ideas of the hereafter were far more degraded than Greek.

Romans believed that their religion had been instituted by the legendary king Numa, for to him they attributed most of their religious institutions—the organization of a religious calendar, the *flamens* or high priests of special deities, the colleges of pontiffs, augurs, and other high functionaries, the worship of various gods such as Terminus, god of boundaries, and Janus, god of all beginnings. But we know that many such institutions antedated Rome and others were later in origin than the time of Numa. It lasted on with waning power to the time of Theodosius the Great who, at the close of the fourth century, suppressed its remnants by imperial decrees in favor of Christianity. It was the type of religion to be expected of the practical and unimaginative Roman people: prosaic, aristocratic, and political in character, better adapted to national life than to personal sentiment, a state religion. Its appeal was never wholly democratic, for the Roman state was long patrician and allowed the plebeians

no part in the public worship, and the long struggle in the early Republic between the orders for equality ending in 367 B.C. was not only political, but religious. Priests were always state officials; altars and temples were supported by the state; ceremonies were supervised by it, and religious law was administered in its courts. Its rituals fostered at first family virtues and only later those of the state. Every family was a tiny church and on its pattern the early state cult was fashioned, prayers and sacrifices ever remaining public ceremonies.

The major characteristic in the history of Roman religion was its hospitality to alien influences which it continually assimilated. During Rome's long career of conquest, beginning with the villages of Latium and continuing to the time under Trajan when she held sway over the Mediterranean world, she received influences from all the peoples she successively conquered—Latins, Etruscans, Greeks, Gauls, Spaniards, Britons, and the Eastern peoples beyond the Mediterranean to the Euphrates. Thus it is difficult to define Roman religion as a whole as more than a polytheism with ritualistic ceremonies, but easy to define its various stages of development. While its evolution extended over many centuries, its degeneration extended over as many more. Such a story, then, is long and complicated, and here only a few of its chief characteristics and outer changes can be noted. Its psychological hold on the people, however, almost eludes us.

Its chief inner characteristics, as just noted, were polytheism and ceremonialism. In course of time it developed a vast number of guardian deities who presided over all human needs and lesser divinities for every condition of life. Few religions, if any outside India, have more falsely divided the godhead. For example, at least seven such lesser divinities watched over the life of infants alone: Parca, the Fate who presided over its birth; Rumina over its suckling; Levana who raised the infant up to be adopted by its father; Fabulinus who helped it to talk, Potina to drink, Edusa to eat, and Cuba who kept it quiet in its crib. Besides a vast array of deities there were few abstractions which were not deified—*Metus* (fear), *Febris* (fever), *Bona* and *Mala Fortuna, Fortuna muliebris* (woman's good fortune), *Fors Fortuna* (lucky chance), *Salus* (safety), *Pietas* (loyalty to parents), *Pax* (peace), *Concordia* (harmony), *Pudicitia* (modesty), *Honor, Virtus,* and a host of others. What Petronius in his *Satyricon* has the Cumæan Quartilla, devotee of Priapus, god of fruitfulness of the fields and herds, say of the welter of Greek gods of South Italy was equally true of those of Rome: "The gods walk abroad so commonly in our streets that you can more easily find a god than a man."

Ceremonialism was so elaborate and rituals were carried out for centuries with such accuracy that some historians have seen in Roman religion merely a body of formalities with little or no religious feeling. Every

major event in human life from birth to death had its appropriate ceremony; so too the seasons, the months, days of the week, occupations, and family meals. Nothing of a public nature was begun at Rome except with the sanction of religion; similarly every private act was a religious one. For the Romans believed that divine influence was at work everywhere in human life. Each deity had its festival or holiday—*feriæ*—carried out with minute ceremonies and with different offerings made to male and female deities: *e.g.*, white victims to the gods above (*di superi*), black to those below (*di inferi*); prayer and sacrificial formulæ so exact that a mistake by the priest might destroy the efficacy of the entire ritual in use at the time. To Ovid, last of the Augustan poets, in his unfinished *Fasti*, we are indebted for an invaluable description of the legendary origins and observances of such festivals. Long after Roman faith had passed and the Roman Empire was no more many such festivals remained so potent that the expanding church had to accept them under new names and changed content.

The early Roman calendar, like the Greek, was merely a priestly device to mark the recurring festivals. The primitive Latin calendar began in March. Its ten months' year, still recalled by the names of our last four months, was transformed, it was believed, by Numa into a lunar year of twelve months or 355 days; was later adjusted to a solar one of 366¼ days by the pontiffs; and was finally corrected to the true solar year by Julius Cæsar with the help of Sosigenes, a Greek astronomer, in 46 B.C., "the last year of confusion" having fifteen months. This is the calendar which, with the final adjustment under Pope Gregory XIII in 1582, serves us yet. The earliest surviving religious calendar, however, dates from 304 B.C., in which forty-five days were noted as sacred to the gods, the various festivals being arranged by magistrates and priests. Besides this and the Julian calendar already mentioned, fragments of some thirty more have survived, which regulated the religious ceremonies of as many festivals.

Of the prehistoric beginnings of Roman religion we can recover something from philology, archæology, comparative Indo-European religions, and especially from survivals into the historic period. On reaching Italy in their long migration from the Danubian grasslands the ancestors of the Romans long remained in the fishing and hunting stage and worshiped spirits or wills, called *numina* by the later Romans. These were impersonal, without temples or idols or religious monuments, dwelling in the early *loca sacra*—trees, groves, springs, hilltops—where they were believed to guard various aspects of nature rather than to be their personification. Fetishes took the place of idols. Thus the spirit of the sky or Jupiter was represented by flint stones, Mars by a lance, Vesta by her perpetual fire.

Some of these spirits were friendly, while others had to be won over by propitiatory and magical rites, by prayer and sacrifice. Out of such indefinite "wills"—"the protoplasm of primitive religion"—were evolved in course of time the gods of the Roman pantheon. They became personified only after the Romans became an organized settled community, the beginning of the state cult being in the late regal period. Among such "spirit guardians" of Indo-European origin, which survived into later antiquity, were the household cults of Vesta, the *Penates, Lares,* and *genius* of every man, and various early manifestations of nature, such as Tellus, Faunus, and Silvanus.

Vesta, at first guardian of flocks and herds, remained ever after the beautiful symbol of the hearth, largely uncontaminated by anthropomorphic features such as gathered around her Greek counterpart, Hestia. Her worship originated in the difficulty of preserving fire in primitive times, from which arose the custom of keeping a continuous community fire long after its need had passed. It was early kept by the daughters of the Latin chieftains in their huts, as it is still kept among the aborigines of Australia. Thus every dwelling became Vesta's home since the hearth in the *atrium* was the centre of the Roman house around which the family daily met for the common meal, the *cena.* Later, when she became a "goddess," she had a public shrine in the Forum near the Regia, the latter evolved from the chieftain's house and the residence of the *pontifex maximus.* Her shrine was round like the original hut, without a statue and with only the symbol of the "spirit," *viz.,* fire. It was the most sacred spot in Rome where the citizens felt themselves united in one great family. The fire within was attended by the vestal virgins, who represented the chieftain's daughters and who dedicated themselves in childhood to thirty years in her service. They were regarded as pure and stainless as the fire itself. They extinguished the fire once a year and rekindled it on the old Latin New Year's, March 1. They lived in the splendid *Atrium Vestæ* just southeast of the Forum, which was destroyed in 382 by the emperor Gratian.

The *Penates,* two guardian house spirits, were given a libation and sacrifice at the hearth and later had a public shrine in the Forum near that of Vesta. The *Lares,* also tutelary spirits of the house as well as of other localities, were spirits of the dead who still hovered about the places where they once lived—a belief which gave rise to the early Roman custom of burial within the house to have them near the living. They also had at crossroads, where the lands of various families met, chapels called *compita,* and an annual festival, *compitalia,* near the winter solstice. At meals bits of food were cast upon the hearth in honor of the *Lares familiares,* whose images stood in the *lararium* near by. *Penates* and *Lares,* then, both guarded the family in the relation of house and home.

Magic was widespread in the primitive religion, if we may judge by its presence in later antiquity. For Roman religion, like others, was reluctant to give up its primitive beliefs. Black or malevolent magic had about disappeared by the time of the "Laws of the Twelve Tables," though sympathetic or homœopathic magic continued through antiquity, *i.e.*, mimicking the effect desired by aiding to produce it. One example will be sufficient—the *aquælicium* or "means to produce rain." During drouths Roman magistrates and matrons carried in procession through the city the *lapis manalis* or "pouring stone" from outside the Porta Capena to the altar of Jupiter Elicius, invoked to send down lightning, to whom a prayer for rain was addressed. Doubtless the stone was hollow and when filled with water would spill over the brim, thus imitating rain overrunning the sky. There were also survivals of early tabus, the mystic influences dwelling in objects making them dangerous and to be avoided. Thus the *flamen Dialis*, chief priest of Jupiter, could not leave Italy, or even Rome for more than two nights each year, and must not touch a horse, dog, goat, corpse, or raw meat, must not walk beneath a vine nor wear an unbroken ring, etc. And Rome, like Greece, had her lucky and unlucky days—*dies fclices*, such as January 1, and *infelices*, such as the anniversary of Rome's defeat at the Allia by the Gauls on July 16th in 390 B.C.

By the time of Numa's lost calendar there were still spirits without anthropomorphic features, but their functions had by then become sharply defined. Still there were no temples nor idols, but only the ancient *loca sacra*, although by then worship reflected the change from an agricultural to an urban politico-military community at Rome. Among the greater spirits worshiped were Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus. Jupiter was the old sky divinity, now regarded as the spirit of light and sunshine, rain and storm, his will revealed, as ever afterwards, by thunder, lightning, and the flight of birds. In public, however, he was invoked second to the old Italian spirit Janus, his *flamens*, though the highest of all, ranking after the latter's priests, because Janus was the god of all beginnings and so of all undertakings. From time immemorial the Latin towns of Latium had celebrated an annual tribal festival in honor of Jupiter *Latiaris*, their guardian spirit, in a grove on the Alban Mount, on whose lower slope Alba Longa had been built by Æneas' son Ascanius three hundred years before Rome. Alba was destroyed by Numa's successor and never rebuilt; instead its inhabitants were transferred to Rome. Still Jupiter was impersonal, the sky itself; even his title *Diespiter*, signifying merely the lord of the heavens, was without any idea of real fatherhood, as was also true in the case of Zeus, his Greek counterpart, who had the same title in the Homeric period.

Mars, later the chief god of Italy after Jupiter, early received the

surname *Gradivus,* "the Strider," though at first he had naught to do with war, but was the patron of agriculture and woodland, herds and flocks, for which reason he was identified with the old Latin deity Silvanus. As protector of Rome he became also identified with Quirinus, originally the ancestral spirit of the Sabines before their fusion with the Romans. The first month of the Latin year was sacred to him as the fertilizing spirit of spring. Numa gave him a college of twelve "dancing" priests, the *Salii,* who worshiped him as a warrior god in processions, while clanging small oval shields, *ancilia,* one of which was believed to have fallen from heaven, on whose preservation Rome's prosperity depended. They sang hymns in obsolete Latin as late as the end of the first century when Quintilian says they were "scarcely understood by their own priests." Quirinus, at first ancestral war-god of the Sabines on the Quirinal, soon became an adjective form of Mars, that is, "he of the spear" (*quiris* being Sabine for "spear"). Through this word the Romans got their civic title *Quirites* as opposed to *Romani.* When Mars became the Roman war-god, *Quirinus* was obscured and in legend became the title of the deified Romulus.

The first great alien influence to alter this simple native religion was that of the Etruscans during their brief conquest of Rome—the only people who conquered the Romans till the close of antiquity. Of Anatolian origin, reaching Italy in the early ninth century B.C., they gradually spread over it from the Alps to Capua, but later were confined to Etruria proper along the Tyrrhenian (Etruscan) seaboard. Their race and language still remain unsolved problems of antiquity. They conquered Rome in the latter half of the sixth century B.C., when the last three kings were of Etruscan origin, and perhaps the name Rome itself came from Etruscan *ruma* (nursing breast). They received into their sombre religion, which permeated all parts of their public and private life, Greek ideas, used Greek builders and artists, and reproduced Greek statuary, pottery, and jewelry, and so became the earliest teachers of the Romans. A more evil gift to Rome were their perverse arts of divination or interpretation of the future by the flight of birds (augury), inspection of the entrails of animals (haruspicy), portents, prodigies, and omens, which completely overlaid native Roman divination and lasted into the fifth century—"the fruitless arts of the most unfruitful of Italian peoples," as Warde Fowler has characterized them.

It was the Etruscan Tarquinius Priscus who first taught the Romans to build temples and to humanize their *numina* by cult statues in terra cotta or wood. He formed a celestial triad of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, an importation from Etruscan Falerii, corresponding with Etruscan Tinia, Cupra, and Menfra. Soon the earliest Roman temple was built in their

honor by Etruscan workmen on the Capitoline which for the next half-millennium was to remain the focus of Roman religion. Tradition has the Elder Tarquin vow and begin it, Servius Tullius raise its walls, the Younger Tarquin complete it, and the Roman consul Horatius in the third year after the expulsion of the kings dedicate it. It was a magnificent structure of native tufa faced with stucco extending over several acres of ground, and was splendidly decorated and filled with works of art by succeeding Roman consuls. It was destroyed by fire in 83 B.C.; was restored by Sulla, who placed a chryselephantine statue within it, and Q. Catulus; was destroyed again in 69 and 80 of our era; and was rebuilt for the last time by the emperor Domitian on a magnificent scale with a Pentelic marble hexastyle colonnade on the front. Here were kept Jupiter's thunderbolts—*lapides silices*—used by the *fetiales* or "guardians of the public faith" in declaring war and peace, whence arose the solemn oath *per Jovem lapidem iurare*. This, then, was the temple of *Jupiter Optimus Maximus*, a title far above that of *Latiaris*. Now for the first time a Roman spirit was personified in a statue, Jupiter having a bearded face like that of the Greek Zeus.

In side aisles were supposably also crude images of Juno and Minerva. The former goddess was merely the expansion of Jupiter like to the earlier Dione or "etymological" wife of the Greek Zeus before he espoused Hera. She presided over marriage and childbirth, her month, originally *Junonius*, being regarded as the favorable time for marriages, as June is yet with us. She, like Saturn, was also in time regarded as guardian of finance, and under the name *Moneta* she later had a temple on the Capitoline which contained the Roman mint, whence the late Latin *moneta* and the English *money* came. Minerva came from Veii and in Rome became Jupiter's daughter and patroness of arts, trades, and crafts of men and women. She also guided men in war. Thus later on she easily became identified with Athena, Greek virgin goddess of wisdom and war. Her great Roman festival began March 9—on the fifth day after the Ides, whence its name *Quinquatrus*—and lasted at first one and later, because of a mistaken meaning of the name, five days, during which boys were accustomed to bring their fees—*Minerval*—to their teachers.

At the beginning of the Republic the Romans through commercial relations with neighboring cities and peoples began to borrow many alien deities. First they took them from the Latin towns which Rome had defeated along with the Etruscans at Lake Regillus *ca.* 498 B.C. Thus the great Greek hero Heracles, whose cult, like others, through contact with the Greek colonies of South Italy already had become widely diffused by the Etruscans among the Italian tribes, came from Latin Tibur and Castor from Latin Tusculum. In Rome Hercules, as he was now called, had

only altars, notably the *Ara Maxima* in the old cattle mart or Forum Boarium which legend had him found, where his rites were carried out in Greek fashion, *i.e.*, with the head of the officiating priest veiled. Castor by 484 B.C. had a temple with his twin, Pollux, near the Forum in gratitude for their supposed help at Lake Regillus. Diana came from Latin Aricia. Originally she was an Italian woodland spirit worshiped on the borders of the Lake of the Woods—Lacus Nemorensis, the present Lake Nemi. Her cult was connected with Lucina, goddess of light, also a surname of Juno, for both goddesses presided over births. She was also the guardian of hunters, and gradually taking over the attributes of Artemis and Hecate, remained, like the former in Greece, "the huntress chaste and fair" of the later Roman poets, her fusion with Artemis being completed centuries later in 179 B.C.

Now began the greatest of all foreign influences which gradually altered Roman religion completely, that of the Greeks through Roman contact with Magna Græcia. From these cities Rome took over deities, religious usages—*Græcus ritus*—and myths, a process not completed till the close of the second century B.C. when the fusion of Greek and Roman deities had formed a very different religion—Græco-Roman—visioned wrongly by Augustus as the faith of the Empire. This Greek influence, already begun in the late regal period through Etruscan mediation, became strong through the *Sibylline Books*, whose oracles introduced Greek elements and whose authority the Roman Senate acknowledged in crises for centuries.

In these books were garnered Greek oracles in hexameter verse originating largely in Anatolia and brought to Cumæ, the oldest Greek colony in South Italy. Traditionally they had been acquired from the Cumæan Sibyl or prophetess of Apollo by the last Tarquin and thereafter were treasured in the vaults of the Capitoline Temple in charge first of the patrician college of *duoviri sacris faciundis*, after 367 B.C. of the decemvirs, and later, beginning with Sulla, of the *quindecimviri*. For centuries this "farrago of nonsense," as Sir James Frazer has called it, was consulted for the Senate to discover divine means by which to avert peril from the state. Their first recorded interference, however, was later than Tarquin, namely, in 496 B.C. when, during a corn famine, they demanded the introduction of Demeter, the Greek Corn Mother, whose cult then reached Rome along with those of her associate deities, Dionysus, god of viticulture, and Persephone, queen of the lower world. The three were later identified with Ceres, the Italian native deity of plant life, Liber, the Italian deity of planting and fructification, and his sister-wife Libera, respectively. In 493 B.C. Ceres had her own temple at the base of the Aventine near the Tiber in the plebeian quarter since most of her devotees

were from the lower classes. The plebeian *ædiles,* servants of the tribunes since 494 B.C., and receiving their name from her temple—*ædes*—which they administered, placed the fines which they imposed on criminals in her shrine, where also was stored confiscated property of traitors, as well as the plebiscites of the assemblies and later the *senatusconsulta.* But Ceres' personality was slowly copied from that of the Greek goddess, and her rites were performed in Greek. Again in the same century (431 B.C.), because of a pestilence, the *Books* recommended the introduction of Apollo, who was already known to the last Tarquin—the first Roman to consult the Greek oracle at Delphi—and Apollo now received a temple in Rome as the god of healing.

In 399 B.C. during an unhealthy summer destructive to animals, the *Books* were consulted and a sacrifice of Greek origin called by the Romans *lectisternium* was introduced at Rome. This was in the nature of a feast offered to the gods whose portable wooden images draped with robes were shown on the streets of Rome reclining on couches before a table laden with food, a rite often used later on occasions of great calamities. Three pairs of non-Roman gods were, according to Livy, thus displayed and their favor besought for eight days. Such a sacrifice was generally followed by a *supplicatio,* a Greek festival of prayer or thanksgiving, also later sponsored by the *Sibylline Oracles,* when men, women, and children walked in procession from Apollo's temple to various altars and temples where they prostrated themselves before images of the gods while the officials of the college in charge of the *Books* offered prayers for help. It was not till 293 B.C.—and again to avert a pestilence—that the real Greek god of medicine, Asclepias, under the Roman name Æsculapius, reached Rome from his shrine at Epidaurus and received a temple on the Tiber island. This is the first we hear of the medical art at Rome.

The fusion of Roman and Greek deities and heroes now continued, the Greek ones being further examples of the *di novensides,* "newly settled," *i.e.,* alien gods, as opposed to the older native *di indigetes.* Thus Mercury, Roman deity of commerce, gain, etc., one part of whose character is shown by his name connected with merchandise (*merx*), originally an Etruscan deity Turms, took over the attributes of Hermes. The Roman Neptune, appearing in Etruscan art as Nethuns, though probably not genuinely Etruscan in origin, god of rivers and springs and, after the Romans became seafarers, of the sea and husband of Salacia, deity of salt water, was merged in the Greek Poseidon, while Salacia became the Nereid Amphitrite, the latter's consort. Saturn, whose Latin name is from the root of *sero* (I sow), became Greek Cronus, who had ousted his father and become sovereign of the world in his stead. Legend had Saturn come to Italy in Janus' reign and found a village on the Capitoline where later at

its foot his temple stood in which the republican treasury was housed. As king, he taught the Italians agriculture and the arts of civilization, and *Saturnia* or *Italia* enjoyed a golden age. His festival, the *Saturnalia,* celebrated just before our Christmas holidays—the festivities of which in part are derived from it—later became the chief Roman one. He, like Ceres, became so overlaid with the attributes of Cronus that little was left of the native Roman god.

Sometimes the fusion was difficult as in the case of Venus-Aphrodite. While the latter, of Oriental-Greek origin, was a human deity of sensuous love as well as a nature power on earth, sea, and in the air, Italian Venus was at first an unimportant spirit of flowers, gardens, and springtime like the Italian Flora. Her Roman cult went back to the regal period, but her fusion with Aphrodite covered her, like Ceres and Saturn, with Greek attributes. The Greek Venus *Erycina,* from Mt. Eryx in western Sicily, reached Rome at the beginning of the Second Punic War, while another, translated as Venus *Verticordia* (turner of men's hearts), came a century later in 114 B.C., again at the order of the *Sibylline Books.* Cæsar extended Venus' worship as *Genetrix,* a cult founded by Scipio Africanus, since he traced his descent from Æneas, her reputed son. April was sacred to her and recalled her early Italian functions; but both ideas, Latin and Greek, are blended in the splendid apostrophe to Venus Genetrix with which Lucretius begins his *De Rerum Natura,* where she is pictured as the creative source of all life.

Such identifications continued through the second century B.C. Thus in 191 B.C. we learn that Iuventas, Roman goddess of youth, was merged with Greek Hebe, goddess of eternal youth as well as handmaiden to the Olympians. Iuventas represented the eternal youth of Rome and first had a chapel on the Capitoline in Minerva's court and later in her own temple in the city below. Roman boys prayed to her and to Jupiter when they assumed the *toga virilis* as the sign that they had reached manhood. We mention one more identification, that of the Greek Hades or Pluto, transliterated into Latin as Pluto or translated as *Dis Pater* (Father Dives, the rich)—a title originally of Jupiter—and poetically, but not in cult, as Orcus, the spirit of oaths which punished perjury. His realm is pictured from Homer on as deep in the bowels of the earth where the ghosts of "men outworn" were conceived as incorporeal shadows which, while retaining the outer form of the living, were bereft of mind and consciousness, their speech unintelligible gibberish likened by the poet to the squeaking of bats. King Hades found his way to Rome in the early Republic and was prominent in the later poets, especially Vergil who, in the sixth book of the *Æneid,* has Æneas descend to the lower world

through a cave beside Lake Avernus near Cumæ, where he saw his father and had a prophetic vision of Rome's future greatness.

But the Greek picture of Hades and his realm did not supplant the degraded native conception of the hereafter held by the Roman masses. Roman religion played no rôle at death, for the dying man had no reckoning to make with the gods, no retributive judgment for his acts here to fear, and felt no need of forgiveness or of the mediation of a priest. He merely passed below to a cheerless abode where he joined the unindividualized "deified" spirits of the departed, euphemistically called *di Manes*, "the good or benevolent ones" (*mānus*, good). In the *Comitium*, the space at one end of the Forum reserved for meetings of the assemblies (*comitia*) and law courts, there was a deep pit regarded as an entrance to the world below (*mundus*) closed by a stone, *lapis manalis* or "Manes stone"—not the "pouring stone" already mentioned in connection with magic. Three times each year, on days sacred to the infernal gods and so marked "unlucky" on the calendar, the stone was lifted, when it was possible for the *Manes* to reappear. Similar pits were commonly dug at the foundations of cities. It was also believed in Rome as in Greece that the dead man before passing below might hover about his tomb, an idea, probably originating in disease from plague-stricken corpses, which led to cremation among both peoples and to special rites at the tomb which bound dead and living together, since it was felt that the dead continued his ghostly participation in the family life above. Mourning lasted nine days, ending with the *cena novendialis* or ninth-day feast, when the living laid aside their mourning garb and appeared in white. Annual rites were also kept up thereafter at the public festival of the *parentalia*, the Roman equivalent of the Catholic festival of "All Saints," and celebrated February 13-21 in honor of the deceased. During this period temples were closed. It was followed on the 22nd by the *caristia*, a family banquet, when presents were exchanged and feuds settled.

Thus the subject of a future life was never definite with the Romans as it was with the Greeks. Throughout the Republic and early Empire a Roman could believe and say what he wished about the future of his soul, quite unlike the Greek who could believe what he would if only he did not promulgate views at variance with those of the state religion, and the Christian who has never rationalized the afterlife although certain there is one somewhere in store for him. Only with the extension of the Oriental mystery cults in the Empire, all of which like Christianity assured a life beyond, did the Roman masses reach definite views about immortality.

During the latter part of the fusion of Greek and Roman religions skepticism and superstition arose because of the lack of faith in the gods and in the efficacy of the *ius divinum*. This was in part caused by the

influx of richer Greek religious ideas due to the *Sibylline Books* which showed the Romans the relative crudeness of their native gods and myths. But it was greatly increased by the wars of the third century: those with the Samnites ending in 290 B.C.; with Pyrrhus 280-275 B.C.; and the two with Carthage 264-241 and 219-201 B.C., especially the second when Rome's military reverses at the hands of her most ruthless enemy, Hannibal, shook Roman faith to its foundations through the belief that, even if the gods existed, they were angry and the *pax deum* could not be restored by the old methods of prayer and sacrifice. Skepticism reached great heights even in the First Punic War against Hamilcar when, for example, the consul Claudius Pulcher, while attacking the Punic fleet off Drepanum in 249 B.C., neglected the warning of his *pullarius* in charge of the sacred chickens that they would not eat and cast them into the sea. This act was followed by his defeat and later condemnation.

But the acid test came in the Second War. After the battle of the Trebia in 218 B.C. many prodigies appeared, Livy recording one of an ox climbing a three-story building in the cattle mart and casting itself down. Just after the battle of Lake Trasimene in 217 B.C. more portents appeared and were explained by the fact that the consul Flaminius had ignored the auspices when leaving the city to take command of the army. To his neglect were laid his defeat and death, and a *ver sacrum* (sacred spring)—employed in crises when the products of the following spring were vowed—was found ineffectual, its fulfillment delayed for twenty-two years. Fabius Maximus, the dictator, restored the rites, but it was rather his plan of "delaying" battle which saved Rome from destruction. The *ludi magni,* at the order of the *Books,* were now added to the old *ludi Romani,* supposed to have been founded by the elder Tarquin in honor of Jupiter. Another *lectisternium* and *supplicatio* were celebrated, the former marking the culmination of the Græco-Roman fusion, since now six pairs of Roman gods corresponding with the twelve great deities of the Greek pantheon, *i.e.,* Græco-Roman, were displayed on the couches, thus ending the exclusiveness of the old *di indigetes.*

After Cannæ in 216 B.C. anxiety again reached fever heat. Two vestals were found to have broken their vows. One of them committed suicide and the other was immured alive in the *Campus Sceleratus* or "Polluted Field" under the city wall in conformity with an ancient law, and their seducers were scourged to death. Quintus Fabius Pictor, Rome's first historian, was sent to Delphi at the suggestion of the *Books* to inquire about the issue of the war and how to appease the angry gods. A Gallic man and woman and a Greek pair were now immured in the Forum Boarium, once the scene of human sacrifices. Prodigies became so frequent in 213 B.C. that, as Livy wrote,

. . . now not only in secret and within the walls of private homes were Roman rites abandoned, but in public places and in the Forum and on the Capitoline there was a crowd of women who were following the custom of their fathers neither in their sacrifices nor in prayer to the gods,[1]

for they felt that their own gods had forsaken them.

In 212 B.C., the year when Hannibal came in sight of Rome, the old indigenous Saturnian verses, once used in the early harvest songs in honor of Saturn, were placed beside the *Sibylline Books* in the temple of Jupiter, thus again marking the apogee of the Græco-Roman fusion. Hasdrubal's crossing the Alps into North Italy in 207 B.C. to effect a junction with his brother caused renewed panic. But after his defeat near the Metaurus twenty-seven maidens were ordered by the consul to dance through the streets of Rome chanting the victory hymn of Livius Andronicus, and a three-day *supplicatio* helped to restore belief that the *pax deum* was again restored.

Plautus, Rome's greatest comic poet, now openly ridiculed on the stage the metamorphosis of Roman into Greek gods with the latter's frailties, especially the amorous adventures of Jupiter-Zeus, as Euripides and Aristophanes had done on the Athenian stage with the traditional gods of Greece years before. In his one burlesque, the *Amphitruo,* imitated ages after by Molière and Dryden, based on the myth of Zeus and Alcmene, Jupiter and Mercury appeared in the *dramatis personæ.* Ennius, "father of Roman poetry," who reached Rome from Calabria in 204 B.C., in his lost tragedies did the same, if we may judge from the two surviving lines of his *Telamo,* in which he asserted that the gods took no interest in human affairs. He also translated the late fourth-century B.C. *Sacred History* of Euhemerus in which the Greek writer recounted his visit to the fabled isle of Panchæa in the Erythræan Sea, in whose capital in a temple of Zeus he saw a column inscribed with the births and deaths of various gods. From this he argued that the gods were merely mortals revered after death for their good deeds on earth. This book increased the prevailing skepticism. It was also in 204 B.C. that, at the order of the *Books,* the first Oriental religion, that of the Great Mother or Cybele of Pessinus in Anatolia, long before identified by the Greeks with their Rhea, reached Rome with her Eastern priests—the Galli—and her fetish, a small black meteoric stone. She was at once received into the Roman pantheon and had a temple on the Palatine by 191 B.C.; thus she was the harbinger of many other sister cults from the Near East. The *Books* cryptically referred to the driving out of Italy of a foreign enemy, officially identified with Hannibal, who, in fact, then retreated into Bruttium, and the following year left Italy for Africa.

[1] Livy, *Hist.* xxv, 1, 7—translated by F. G. Moore (*Loeb Class. Libr.*).

Skepticism continued rife throughout the second century B.C. Now the *Sibylline Books* were used for more outright purposes than the ousting of Hannibal. Earthquakes became so frequent in 193 B.C. that the Senate could not properly function, since the consuls who convened it were busy performing expiatory rites. A *supplicatio* was ordered and followed by the consuls' proclaiming a most curious decree, that on any day when an earthquake was first reported and the rites ordained no other should be reported!

It was in this period of skepticism that Roman religion was affected by two practical hellenistic philosophies, Stoicism and Epicureanism, which reached Italy about the middle of the second century B.C. While the tendency of Greek religion to increase the pantheon and elaborate cult practices had been curbed by philosophy, which finally subordinated polytheism to rationalism and, ridding it of its crass mythology, insisted that the gods must be just and moral, Roman religion had undergone no such intellectual catharsis. This was due largely to the Roman temperament and also to the fact that after the Punic Wars the Romans in building a world power had had little interest in speculation. Consequently, cult ceremonies ever remained the expression of Roman faith. Later with the expansion of Oriental mystery religions emotionalism rather than rationalism was the result. Roman religion had by now degenerated into mere perfunctory performance of the rituals and had little hold on the masses and less on the educated classes, the latter finding comfort in the new philosophies.

Stoicism, brought to Rome from Athens in 144 B.C. by Panætius, later head of the school in Athens, favored religion by explaining man's place in the universe and his relationship to God. It has been called the final attempt in antiquity to present a logical world and man's place in it and to distinguish between true and false religion and the last expression of the ancient mind before the advent of Christianity. Its adherents similarly asserted, as we see in Cleanthes' famous *Hymn to Zeus*, in part quoted by St. Paul in his speech at Athens (Acts 17:28): "We are also his offspring," *i.e.*, part of the Divine Reason or God. It inculcated a stern morality which harmonized with the Roman character, and its indifference to externals—pain or pleasure, poverty or wealth, illness or health—found a ready appeal among Romans through its emphasis on virtue as the aim of life and on living in accord with nature, for these things coincided with old Roman virtues of manhood, courage, honesty, etc. So Stoicism influenced as an ethical system and later as a philosophy of life some of the noblest men of the late Republic such as the Younger Cato, and of the early Empire such as Persius, Epictetus, Seneca, and, above all, the emperor Marcus Aurelius by far the finest spirit among Rome's imperial rulers.

whose priceless *Meditations* in Greek have fortunately reached us, translated into all civilized languages and still influencing many great men of our time. Stoicism was, in Bertrand Russell's words, "a free man's religion," and it has been well said that the older republican heroes were "unconscious" Stoics, even as many Christians of our day still practice the Stoic virtues.

Epicureanism, on the other hand, was, despite its attractiveness as a system of thought, repellent as an ethical one, subversive of religion in general, and in Rome merely fed the prevailing unbelief. It taught that man's duty was to increase pleasure and diminish pain, pleasure both of mind and body; that happiness rather than virtue was the true aim of life, but that this could only be attained through virtue. Its great Roman expositor was the poet-philosopher Lucretius—Stoicism had no comparable figure in its annals—whose *De Rerum Natura* in hexameter verse and archaic diction is one of the great masterpieces of Latin literature, unfortunately seldom read in our academic classical programs. Cicero's antagonism to the system, as especially seen in his *De Natura Deorum,* in which he asserted that Epicurus "abolished divine beneficence and divine benevolence, uprooted and exterminated all religion from the human heart," helped to injure its popularity in Rome. By the beginning of the Empire few men openly espoused its doctrines. But in Nero's day its perverted form of sponsoring sensuous pleasures had a vogue with *la jeunesse dorée* of the playboy emperor's court under the leadership of Petronius, its *arbiter elegantiarum.* Then it was that it took on its sinister connotation still expressed by our words "epicure" and "epicurism."

An excellent summary of its teaching is found among the fragments of the first two books of Epicurus' lost *De Natura* discovered over a century ago in Herculaneum. One of these—four lines and twelve words in Greek—has been translated thus:

> There is nothing to fear in God;
> There is nothing to feel in Death;
> What is good is easily procured;
> What is ill is easily endured.

But Epicurus' attempt thus to destroy the two most harassing fears of human life, God and death, and his argument that there is no life beyond the grave since he taught that the soul at the death of the body became dissolved in the atoms of which it is composed, set the system outside the pale of religion. While Stoicism found God in the eternal fire at the centre of the universe, the Epicureans relegated their gods to a blissful *dolce far niente* far off in space where they rejoiced in their own perfection but took no heed of mortals whose prayers and reverence could not reach them.

Philosophy did not stay the decay of religion at Rome which continued its course of disintegration throughout the last century of the Republic. Stoicism had compromised with it and had thus shown the way for it to be a political tool. Roman religion had long been regarded as a restriction on political advancement. Such restriction was especially felt by the high religious officials, notably the *flamens*. Since they were appointees of the *pontifex maximus,* the latter could compel them to serve even if it meant their political suicide. An example is furnished by Livy[2] in 189 B.C., even before the introduction of the Greek philosophies. Q. Fabius Pictor, both prætor and *flamen Quirinalis,* was kept from going to his province, Sardinia, when his prætorship was over since a *flamen* could not leave Italy. After debates in the Assembly and Senate he was ordered to retain his religious office from which he had tried to resign. Such examples multiplied in later years. Political restrictions were so strongly resented that the office of *flamen Dialis* (Jupiter), believed to have been instituted by Numa and burdened, as we have seen, by exacting ceremonies, lay vacant during three quarters of the first century B.C. (from Sulla to Augustus, 87-11 B.C.), since no one wanted to be barred from political advancement by holding it. By now the sacred colleges of immemorial antiquity—*flamens,* pontiffs, augurs, *fetiales,* etc.—enjoyed only social prestige.

Still the old state cult functioned officially, its outworn ceremonies and machinery of worship strictly observed. But now prayer formulæ were merely mumbled; sacrifices had lost all meaning; lustration or purification of temples, houses, and individuals was only a spectacle; the *votum* or tacit contract between gods and men was without validity; priests meddled with politics; temples were empty and falling into ruin; priesthoods were vacant, and the religious calendar neglected. No wonder that Varro, "most learned of the Romans," who died in 28 B.C. on the very threshold of the Empire expressed the fear "lest the gods might perish not from enemy invasion, but from neglect of the citizens"; and Cicero, in true Catonian spirit, wrote that "it seems astounding that one augur does not laugh when he sees another."

It seemed, then, that Roman religion was not only moribund but already dead, merely the shell of what it once had been, the motive power of Roman greatness. Almost the only part of it still uncorrupted at the close of the Republic was reverence for the prehistoric household gods—*Penates, Lares,* and the *genius* of the head of the family—and for the rural gods—Faunus, Silvanus, Tellus, etc. Still, despite its meaningless formalism, Roman religion, or what was left of it, remained the expression of religious feeling. Cicero, while ready to denounce its hollow conventions,

[2] *Hist.* xxxvii, 51.

nevertheless praised the reality behind them, when he wrote that *in religione, id est, cultu,* the Romans surpassed all other peoples, and asked if it was not by divinity's power that this great empire had been created, extended, and sustained. It seemed that the faith of the eternal city, now extended into an empire, was a thing of the past. It had become so empty of real feeling that it is surprising that it could come to life again and last for centuries, changed but still retaining some of its past splendor. This was due to the national character and especially to the efforts of one great man, the founder of the Roman Empire, Augustus Cæsar.

Augustus' revival of the waning religion, disintegrated by a skepticism largely the product of war and especially of the civil strife of the last century of the Republic, is not only the most notable event in the story of Roman religion but stands alone in that of religion in general. It is a remarkable witness to his ability that he, a freethinker, should have effected a renascence of the ancient state cult, making the *ius divinum* once more real and giving the dying religion a new lease of life which was to extend over centuries to come. Over three centuries later, Constantine, who likewise stood on the threshold of a new epoch in European history, was still interested in Augustus' revival, retaining the title, *Pontifex Maximus,* which represented the old faith as well as the new one of Christianity; and Julian a generation later tried to revive it once more though with little success. Its fragments were extinguished by Theodosius the Great at the close of the fourth century and still later in the fifth by Theodosius II in his famous code which banished forever even the household gods.

Augustus' plan was as much political as religious, aimed at arousing patriotism and loyalty to his new regime. It was part of his legislation to recall the Roman people to the practice of their ancient virtues and to initiate them into the new idea of an empire ruled by an autocrat. Thus his work may be called the beginning of the alliance of throne and altar which played so prominent a part in after ages. For he believed, as had Ennius nearly two centuries earlier, as we see in the only surviving fragment of the latter's *Annals,* that *moribus antiquis stat res romana virisque,* and he attributed the débâcle of the Republic at the hands of Rome's masterful leaders who fought to control her destinies from the time of Tiberius Gracchus to that of Julius Cæsar to the decline of religion and morality.

He focused attention no longer on an abstract state but on his own person, a plan which unfortunately disclosed at the beginning the shadow which finally wrecked it. For now Rome took the step already taken by the Greeks centuries earlier which led to the deification of his successors, transforming the emperor from a god-man or superman into a man-god.

He also aimed at winning the Roman masses from the attraction of Oriental cults which now, two centuries after the introduction of Cybele, had become strong, since he regarded them as a menace. He centred the new Græco-Roman religion in Apollo, his tutelary deity at Actium in 31 B.C., by dedicating a temple to him in 28 B.C. on the grounds of his Palatine residence, a magnificent structure stored with works of art, thus making the Græco-Roman deity the equal of the Latin Jupiter ensconced five centuries before on the neighboring Capitoline. The year before on returning from Egypt he had himself enrolled as augur and member of the *quindeciumviri,* but waited to assume the title *Pontifex Maximus* till the death in 12 B.C. of Lepidus, his former colleague in the triumvirate, who held it. This title was to be borne by all his pagan and Christian successors down to Gratian (367-383) as the symbol of their leadership of the religion of Rome.

In 17 B.C. he revived the old neglected *ludi sæculares* as the basis of a new *sæculum* of 110 years. We still have the *Carmen Sæculare* composed by Horace for the occasion, its most lasting monument if not, as Ferrero has called it, "a magnificent poem." Herein the court poet deplored the waning of faith and asked for legislation to resuscitate it, thus disclosing the emperor's belief that Roman greatness still depended on religion and morality as much as on good government. The games were not wholly Roman since, as Horace tells us, they rested on an oracle in the *Sibylline Books,* and were celebrated outside the Pomerium on the Tiber's embankment that the infernal gods might not be brought within and since they were in honor of Greek rather than Roman deities, as Zosimus, Greek historian of the fifth century, points out. It all proclaimed the cosmopolitan character of the revived religion.

We learn of the revival largely from the biography of Augustus by Suetonius in the early second century and from only ten words in the emperor's official account of his acts published at his death by Tiberius, the famous *Res gestæ* still to be read in Greek and Latin on the walls of the revived temple of *Augustus et Roma* in the Turkish capital Ankara—the ancient Ancyra in Galatia. In these ten words he says that he restored eighty-two temples in the city, among them the old one of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitoline, popularly believed to have been built by Romulus, and that of Cybele on the Palatine, one of the more recent—the only Oriental deity whom he recognized. On the spot in the Forum where Cæsar's body was exposed to the people he already in 29 B.C. had erected a temple to *Divus Julius,* the first dead emperor to become a god, and as a special act of *pietas* in 2 B.C. he dedicated a temple in the Forum Augusti to Mars Ultor, "the avenger," the traditional ancestor of Rome, a splendid structure described by Ovid.

Suetonius says that he burned some two thousand rolls of oracles in Greek and Latin and retained only the "genuine" *Sibylline Books,* copies of which were brought in 12 B.C. from the Capitoline temple of Jupiter to that of Apollo where they rested in gilded cases beneath the pedestal of the god till 405 when they were burned by Honorius' Vandal general, Stilicho. He increased the number of the priesthood, their privileges and allowances, notably those of the vestal virgins, and erected a new shrine to Vesta on the Palatine. He restored religious offices, notably the *flamen Dialis,* and lightened his ceremonies as well as those of the *rex sacrorum* which latter lasted into the third century. He reorganized the *fetiales, Luperci, Salii,* and *Fratres Arvales,* all of which were prehistoric in origin.

While in 27 and 23 B.C he had refused deification, and in 13 B.C. an altar in the Regia, the residence of the *pontifex maximus,* he accepted one in the temple of Peace in 9 B.C. but declined divine honors which had captivated his granduncle and had led to the latter's assassination. Later, however, he allowed his name to be associated with religion in a way that made it possible for the Senate to recognize him as divine. The custom of deifying live men had long been known in the hellenistic age and had been extended even to Roman governors in the East beginning with Flamininus who was worshiped in Greece with Apollo and Heracles in 196 B.C. Now his name was coupled with that of personified Roma in an Eastern cult which he allowed to be encouraged in the West, but not in Italy. *Augustus et Roma* finally, however, reached Italy but still as an Oriental cult served by the *seviri,* six Oriental freedmen, called *Augustales,* who were devoted to him and later kept up the worship of his deified successor. In 29 B.C. the Senate declared that a libation should be made at mealtimes to his *genius* and in 7 B.C. he had statues of his *genius* placed with those of the *Lares compitales* at crossroad chapels, which also raised him above mortals. Even his name, Augustus, given him by the Senate in 27 B.C. elevated him to the rank of divinity. Thus deification began in Rome under him and after his death the imperial cult of Cæsar became official.

With Augustus' revival Roman religion properly ends. For that revival, centring in his person, contained within it elements of its destruction—its obsoleteness; competition with Eastern mystery cults whose emotional appeal, the very essence of true religion, suited the popular religious needs far better; and, above all, as already noted, its tendency to Cæsar worship. It kept, however, many of its outer forms officially to the time of the Severi two hundred years later, since Augustus' successors found it advantageous to support them; and remnants lasted into the fifth century. But Augustus' Græco-Roman religion was not to be the faith

of the empire. The official religion from Augustus to Diocletian was Cæsar worship which, though Augustus and Tiberius were reluctant to accept it, became widespread in the latter's reign. Beginning with Augustus the Roman people felt a security which had been unknown for centuries past. The temple of Janus after Actium had been closed for the third and last time in Roman history. He and his successors with their great power were regarded as Providences on earth. But that faith, somewhat like Shintoism in modern Japan, aimed largely at loyalty to the state, while a new type of religion with a very different appeal had already begun its sway among the masses, namely, that offered by the Near East cults. These cults had come to Rome in such numbers that Juvenal said, "The Syrian Orontes poured into the Tiber." And he might have included the Nile, the Halys, and the Euphrates, for they came not only from Syria—Syria Dea or Atargatis and solar cults—but from Egypt—Isis and Serapis—from Anatolia—Cybele and Ma—and, the best of them all, Mithra from Persia. These, with their mystic secret rites, colorful processions, ceremonies of expiation and redemption, and assurance of immortality, brought satisfaction to the masses while, at the same time, late semireligious Greek philosophies, such as Neo-Pythagoreanism and Neo-Platonism, brought comfort to the educated. It was, then, this body of cults and philosophies, together with Christianity, the common enemy of them all, which formed the cosmopolitan faith of the Roman Empire, but not in the sense intended by Augustus. For none of them could be synthesized with the old state cult beyond mere outward conformity in worship.

After a show of power under Julian (A.D. 361-363) the old cult still lived on with ever-waning numbers and prestige, characterized by a recent writer as "a mosaic to which traditions, superstitions, poetry and a general inquiry lend their share." Its chief official refuge at the end was in a small group of Roman aristocrats who still clung to it in face of Christian victory because it was part of the classical heritage to which they still were loyal. The ancient titles of augur and *quindecimvir* were still kept like those of consul and tribune but with little of their former importance left. For Roman polytheism, once supreme over Republic and early Empire, "Cæsarism," the later alien cults from the East, and the philosophies from Greece, had all been vanquished by Christianity. But the victor needed no triumph thus late over paganism since the latter's suppression was already certain when Constantine favored Christianity, first in the Eastern half of the Empire and then in the Western where it lasted till the time of Theodosius I, rightly called "the exterminator of paganism." For it was he who in 393 abolished the Olympic Games which had been celebrated historically for over a millennium under the sanction of Zeus; who withdrew all state largesses from religious worship; who drove out

priests, closed temples, and let them fall into ruins; who ended most of the festivals, and by his famous (or rather infamous) decree of 381 ended liberty of thought in the ancient world by making Roman Catholicism the sole religion of the Roman state.

But paganism had long been dead. Aurelian (270-275) had installed on the Capitoline the Palmyrene *Sol invictus* as "protector of his Empire" with its own pontiffs and priests rivaling those of the Roman gods, and later in 307 Diocletian and his former colleagues had erected an altar to Mithra in the ancient Celtic town of Carnuntum on the Danube as "protector of their Empire." These two events mark not only the culmination of Oriental influence at Rome but the death of Roman paganism as well. But even after Christianity had vanquished all its opponents, remnants of Rome's ancient faith, now reduced to superstition, survived, even as Greek religion did, among the countryfolk as a sort of cryptic Christianity. For the peasants, irrespective of imperial decrees, still observed in addition to Christian rites many pagan ones, revering haunted springs, trees, groves, and hilltops, keeping some of the ancient festivals, especially those connected with agriculture, and worshiping the spirits of hearth and home as their distant ancestors had done. Many of the old festivals proved stubborn before the advancing church which had to accept them. Among such is the *Lupercalia* in honor of Faunus under the name of Lupercus, perhaps the oldest in Rome and which had been renewed by Augustus. It was transformed into the Christian "Festival of Purification" after a long struggle in 494 under Pope Gelasius I.

VIA THEOLOGICA[1]

RAYMOND L. HIGHTOWER
Kalamazoo College

THROUGH the centuries Christianity has been acknowledged as a "way," a "way of life." This convenient metaphor continues to incite the imagination, for it immediately suggests a question for every student of religion. What way, or which way? It is the narrow, exacting way. It is the broad, liberal way. It is the illumined way. It is the sorrowful way. It is the glorious way. It is the tragic way. Certainly, few earnest theological students today would care to boast that it is an easy way. It is more hazardous than the road from Jerusalem to Jericho.

Whoever consciously offers his talents in service to others may observe that most people are, if not lost souls, at least timid souls. They cry out for maps, charts, pictures, symbols, all sorts of aids and assurances. They collect fetishes and indulge in extravagant rites and ceremonies, that they may surround themselves with the fashionable safety devices. Some rely unduly upon the written word, some upon the spoken. All organized religions seem to designate the majority as laymen, and the few as professionals. The former look to the latter to provide them with assistance and direction. In our civilization Christian ministers are recognized professional persons. They dare not take the responsibilities of their profession lightly. And yet, unless they are able to stay out of ruts themselves, they will be of little aid in getting others out of the mud.

During my student days at Crozer a certain visiting representative of the profession set forth the desirability and advantage of a minister's being a "middle-of-the-road" person. He pointed out how much more service a pastor could render in his community if he kept to the middle of the road. The analogy seemed to have about the same significance to him as keeping one's head above water, or perhaps, keeping out of the woods. It distressed some of us. We thought of a certain local drunk wandering home late at night, apparently concentrating on the middle of Upland Avenue, while the traffic dodged around him. The press recently reported that when a policeman in Omaha, Nebraska, shouted at a man in the middle of the street, the linewalker asked to be let alone because he was trying to prove that he was sober.[2] One must have his wits about him in order to stay on the sidewalks, or to walk narrow paths.

Perhaps we are distorting our visiting preacher's idea. Keeping to the middle of the road might suggest the traffic cop, quite sober and at his

[1] A revision of the author's chapel talk at Crozer, August 22, 1944.

[2] *Kalamazoo Gazette*, August 24, 1944.

post of duty. He stands out in the middle of the street to direct others and to make their travel less dangerous. His job is that of position, and in it he becomes heavy and flat-footed—until he is displaced by traffic signals which function automatically. Surely the minister has other work to do than the flashing of stop-and-go signals, with some cautions in between. Although none of these road scenes are satisfactory, we must be fair to those who advocate "middle-of-the-road" philosophies.

Probably they are mindful of the curb dangers, and the traps of soft shoulders. We must keep our feet on firm ground and our wheels on the solid pavement, if we are to move with the traffic. Wise men of China, India, and Greece have taught that the ethical and sensible way of life consists in keeping away from the extremes. For more than two thousand years the doctrine of the mean has been popular as the way of prudence and virtue. Plato taught it, and Aristotle made temperance and the "golden mean" stanch in the morality of the West, even unto our day. It is supported by the sayings of Confucius and the *Madhyamaka* of Buddhism. Have we not converted these philosophies into trite and depraved rules of safety-first? The job must be preserved and all factions appeased. We must get deliberately in the middle. There must be no daring decisions. We must play safe with our constituencies, for they are potential customers. "After all," we say apologetically, *"veritas in medio stat."* We are heirs of a vulgar mode of thought which would put us all in the middle of the road. It is mistakenly labeled a safety zone.

Anyone who professes to articulate a "way of life" today finds himself face to face with a tormenting host of traditional dualities. Impressive volumes in theology and philosophy persuade us to reckon with such combinations as God and the devil, good and evil, saint and sinner. A variety of enthusiastic envoys spread before us the contrasting ideologies of individualism and collectivism, capitalism and communism, dictatorship and democracy, free will and determinism, heaven and hell. Dualisms and schemes of balancing opposites drive most of us to the assumed safety of the middle of the road. The intellectual aspects of our culture are so weighted with antonymous dualities that many of our noblest ideas perish in their incipiency, destroyed by what is conceived as their opposites. The Chinese struggled for generations with a *yang* and *yin* cosmology. Hegel attempted a reconciliation of opposites. We see it in Marx with his dialectic of materialism, and in the concern of modern psychoanalysis with ambivalence. The eclecticism of the last century proved to be almost completely sterile, although it was described as "fast becoming the dominant philosophy of the nineteenth century."[3] In a sense the current

[3] M. V. Cousin, *Course of the History of Modern Philosophy,* translated by O. W. Wright, 1866—translator's preface, Vol. I, p. 10.

dualistic confusion is a trap for every honest student, making cowards of us all. "And thus the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."[4] It is not yet the time to evaluate the European debacle in terms of the crudities of the intellectual minds. But what was there to prevent Hitler and his *Mein Kampf* when the twentieth-century mental giants piled up in the middle of the road? For some twenty years the petty brain and projected chin of Mussolini fashioned the destiny of a great people while the timid fathers of wisdom wobbled between the rock of Scylla and the whirlpool of Charybdis. Students of religion should know that theology has ceased to be the queen of the sciences and philosophy a kingly discipline because the so-called wisdom of the world has pushed too many of us into the middle of the road.

Fifty-four years have passed since the death of John Henry (Cardinal) Newman.[5] Some of his essays have become classic, but we celebrate his life primarily because, as a young man, he gave virile leadership to the Oxford movement in England.[6] He sought to lay out a *via media* for the Church of England. It is usual to look upon this attempt at a way for the church somewhere between Rome and Geneva as a compromise, and a failure. Newman's love for certain aspects of organized Christianity finally led him into the Roman Catholic Church. However, his admirers point out that he never sought the safety of a middle-of-the-road position. Apparently he was no more at home in the Roman Catholic Church than in the Church of England. One of his contemporaries says that he early let it be known that those who went with him were making "ventures of faith."[7] One of his biographers could find no life of the nineteenth century which could compare with that of Newman "in unity of meaning and constancy of purpose."[8] Such an intrepid critic as Dean Inge remarks with approval that throughout his career he was a witness "against any compromise with the shifting currents of popular opinion."[9] Probably few of us today will gain much energy of thought from the theology of Newman. However, his life and work ought to suggest a distinction between the *via media* and that interpretation of the doctrine of the mean which invites us to go along in the middle of the road. The *via media* was wrought with great diligence, great boldness, and intellectual honesty. The life of Newman might well remind us that the "way" in our generation has to be cut with sharp and durable tools. It must be prepared courageously.

[4] Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* Act III, Scene 1.
[5] Newman died August 11, 1890.
[6] Not to be confused with Buchmanism.
[7] James H. Rigg, *Oxford High Anglicanism and Its Chief Leaders,* 1895, p. 113.
[8] Richard H. Hutton, *Cardinal Newman,* 1890, p. 250.
[9] W. R. Inge, *Outspoken Essays* (First Series), 1923, p. 202.

A middle way has been proposed for America.[10] At the present it is not clear as to what the proposal encompasses. It should be emphatically stated by religious leaders that it is not simply a compromise of two extremes. Those who are working sincerely for American democracy know that they are not preparing a potpourri of the spiced flower petals of monarchy and the unsorted leaves of anarchy. It is rather a way the success of whose building is in the hands of the keenest and bravest spirits of our time. So, also, with Christianity in this modern world. We must strike out boldly if we are to make a "way." One reason that Nietzsche struck with such great impact upon Western civilization is found in his forthright determination to clear a way through the jungle of tangled dualities of the nineteenth century. In H. L. Mencken's life of Nietzsche he entitles one of his chapters "Blazing a New Path."[11] We need to mark out a way in our own theological studies at the present time. These studies suffer from our hankering after an uneasy safety. This search for a sanctuary in the middle of somebody's road is the most saddening feature to which we have fallen heir.

According to the *Razor's Edge* the devil tempted Jesus once again beyond the temptation reported in the gospel account. He promised Jesus shame, disgrace, scourging, a crown of thorns, and death on the cross as the way that Jesus might save the human race. Jesus fell for this temptation. "The devil laughed till his sides ached, for he knew the evil men would commit in the name of their redeemer."[12] We can do many foolish things in the name of the Christ. We can even lay down our lives inconsequentially. We can spend our years in the "middle of the road." But there is a nobler calling. There is a path to be hewn with expert hands. It will be done by the sweat of the brow. Undoubtedly many theological students get sore feet trying to trudge along in the ruts of a bygone century. It is better to get sore hands chopping out a "way of life." The *via theologica* ought to be a bold adventure.

[10] *Cf.* H. E. Barnes and O. M. Ruedi, *The American Way of Life*, 1942.
[11] *The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*, 1908, chap. III.
[12] W. Somerset Maugham, *The Razor's Edge*, 1944, pp. 226 f.

ANTI-SEMITISM

SOLOMON ZEITLIN
Dropsie College

THE WORD *anti-Semitism* is a modern term that was coined in Germany in the last century, but the animosity against the Jews goes back to antiquity. The causes of anti-Semitism have been dealt with in different ways by theologians, economists, anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists, and they have suggested various remedies. No doubt anti-Semitism, which is a disease that may be called *Judophobia,* is a fitting subject for all these scientists. It has, however, a long history. To understand the causes of anti-Semitism we must first relate its history and outline its development. The psychologists or the sociologists who undertake to solve the problem of anti-Semitism must be familiar with its origin and background. The physician must not only be able to diagnose a disease but must know its cause and determine whether it was hereditary.

Anti-Semitism is treated now from all angles, particularly from the sociological angle. The main factor, the history of anti-Semitism, is usually overlooked. In this essay I shall give a historical survey of the origin and development of anti-Semitism throughout the ages.[1]

Judophobia began with the Diaspora; it was not, however, the Diaspora which brought about the ill will towards the Jews but the Jewish idea that God was universal and the only God and that the deities of all the other nations were abominable idols which ought not to be worshiped. The Jews differentiated themselves from all the nations of the world by rejecting the various deities worshiped by them and also by denying that the kings were deities. The Jews refused to worship and to bow to the god of the state. They would not participate in the libations in honor of the king. Their conception of the universality of God, in fact their intolerance of polytheism, aroused hostility against them.

In many cities they were almost annihilated. Thousands upon thousands were killed in many cities of the hellenistic world, but the Jews with their uncompromising belief that there is only God and that he is the God of the universe paved the way for Paul, the apostle to the gentiles, to preach his gospel and to gain recruits among the pagan world. Thus the Jews of the Diaspora who shed their blood upholding the idea of a universal God were in great measure indirectly responsible for the spread of Christianity through the pagan world. Therefore we may truly say that the blood of the Jews of the Diaspora was the seed of the Church.

In the pre-Diaspora period, when the Jews lived in Palestine, there

[1] This essay is a summary of a work to be published in the future.

was no hatred in particular against them. Then the Jews fought their neighbors or their neighbors fought them as did many other nations at that time. There was no specific hatred anywhere against the Jews as Jews.

The first manifestation of anti-Jewish feeling is recorded in the Book of Esther when Haman said to the king, "There is a people scattered among the nations in all thy kingdom; and their laws differ from those of other nations, and the laws of the king they do not keep. Therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them."[2] In this book for the first time we find mention of hatred against the Jews and the reason therefor, namely, that the Jews had different laws and did not observe the laws of the king. This was the battle cry of all those who accused the Jews of not joining in the celebration of the birthdays of kings (since they were deities) or of not worshiping the god of the state. We do not know when and where this book was written, but it certainly reflects the early attitude of the pagan world against the Jews and Judaism.

The animosity against the Jews because of their religion deepened more and more in the hellenistic period. It was especially strong in Egypt. The Jews were not a conquered people in that country. They came there by their own will or at the invitation of the Ptolemies to settle in Alexandria.[3] Some Jews who had been mercenaries in the Ptolemiac army settled in Egypt.[4] Similarly the Jews settled in the empire of the Seleucids. The Jews were granted civil rights and also received the privilege of worshiping their God unmolested. They were absolved from worshiping the deities of the state. The native Egyptians who were conquered by the Ptolemies felt particularly bitter against the Jews since they were not the conquerors but nevertheless enjoyed civil rights while they themselves did not have such rights.[5] Moreover the Jews did not worship the god of the state. The Egyptians and the entire hellenistic world, particularly the conquered peoples, charged the Jews with not being loyal to the state and agitated that the privileges granted by the kings and the emperors to the Jews should be revoked. Indeed the entire hellenistic world looked upon the Jews with distrust and even with apprehension. They regarded them as a different people, a people who did not want to associate with other peoples. They considered them atheists who did not believe in a god. Tacitus in his *History* criticized the Jews for their religion. "The Jews conceive of one god only," he wrote, "and that with the mind alone; they regard as impious those who make from perishable materials representations of gods in man's image; that supreme and eternal being is to them incapable of representation and without end. Therefore they set up

[2] Esth. 3:8.
[3] Josephus, *c. Apion.* i, 22.
[4] See Edwyn Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty.*
[5] *Ibid.*, Chap. IV.

no statues in their cities, still less in their temple. This flattery is not paid their kings nor this honor given to the Cæsars."[6] Since the Jews refused to worship the emperor and to bring sacrifices to him, they were accused of not being loyal citizens. And Apion, as quoted by Josephus, asked why it was that if the Jews were citizens of Alexandria they did not worship the same god as the Alexandrians.[7] Because the Jews did not participate in the libations and the sacrifices to the king they were slandered as enemies of humanity. This sort of hostility towards the Jewish religion is shown in the words of Philostratus: "The Jews have long been in revolt not only against the Romans, but against humanity; and a community that has made its own a life apart and irreconcilable, that cannot share with the rest of mankind in the pleasures of the table nor join in their libations or prayers or sacrifices. . . ."[8]

The accusations which were hurled against the Jews by the pagan philosophers, historians, and writers were not against the Jews as an ethnic group but against Judaism as a religion. Tacitus charged the Jews, "They sit apart at meals, they sleep apart, . . . they adopted circumcision to distinguish themselves from other peoples by this difference. Those who are converted to their ways follow the same practice, and the earliest lesson they receive is to despise the gods, to disown their country, and to regard their parents, children, and brethren as of little account."[9] The basis of his accusations is apparent. The Jews could not share meals with the pagans because those meals were devoted to the god of the pagans. The Jews could not intermarry. However, when a pagan accepted Judaism, he became the equal with any Jew and enjoyed fellowship with all the Jews.[10] Tacitus was right when he said that those who were converted to Judaism despised their former gods; Judaism did not recognize any local gods. And his statement that those who accepted Judaism disowned their country is partially correct since state and god were one. Tacitus' statement that the converts to Judaism regarded their parents, sisters, and brothers, as of little account is quite understandable since one who accepted Judaism could not very well associate with his pagan parents or with the pagan members of his family. We should bear in mind that the Christians were also charged with alienating converts from their near kin. Judaism and Christianity sponsored a universal God; therefore Christians also were deemed incapable of being citizens since they did not worship the emperor

[6] Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 5—*Iudæi mente sola unumque numen intellegunt: profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum offingant; summum illud et æternum neque imitabile neque interiturum. Igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus hæc adulatio, non Cæsaribus honor.*

[7] Josephus, *c. Apion* ii, 6.

[8] Philostratus, *Vit. Apollon.* v, 33.

[9] Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 5.

[10] See S. Zeitlin, "Judaism as a Religion," in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XXXV (1944), pp. 193-200.

as a god.[11] They were charged with being disloyal and with showing disrespect to their parents. According to the Gospel of Matthew Jesus said, "For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law."[12]

Cicero in his defense of Flaccus called the Jewish religion a barbaric superstition. He maintained that it was at variance with the glory of the empire.[13] It is quite logical that Judaism, which maintained the universality of God, should be at variance with the Roman idea of a national god.

Judaism was a mystery to the pagans. They could not comprehend worshiping a god of whom there was no image, a god who could not be seen. They could not conceive how one could worship such a god. These accusations which were brought against the Jews because of their religion were later launched with even greater force against the Christians. They too were accused of not being loyal citizens[14] since they did not worship the god of the country.[15] They were charged with killing people so as to get blood for ritual purposes.[16] They were supposed to devour infants and engage in incestuous banquets.[17] Christianity, like Judaism, in maintaining the idea of the universality of God fought against idol worship. Christianity was as much of a mystery to the pagans as Judaism had been in previous days. Hence we see that the same libels launched against Judaism were offered against Christianity. Thus Tertullian said that in the eyes of the pagan world the Christian was "a man of every crime, an enemy of the gods, of the emperor, of the laws, of good morals, of all nature."[18] And Tacitus calls Christianity a wicked superstition:

> . . . a class of men loathed for their vices, whom the crowd styled Christians. Christus, the founder of the name, had undergone the death penalty in the reign of Tiberius by the sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilatus, and the pernicious superstition was checked for a moment, only to break out once more not merely in Judæa, where the disease originated, but in the capital itself, where all things horrible or shameful in the world collect and find a vogue.[19]

According to the same historian the Christians were charged with the burning of the city of Rome. Tertullian bitterly exclaimed that the pagans

[11] Tertullian, *Apol.* 10—*Deos, inquitis, non colitis, et pro imperatoribus sacrificia non impenditis. . . . Itaque sacrilegii et maiestatis rei convenimur.*

[12] Matt. 10: 35.

[13] Cicero, *pro Flacco* 28.

[14] Tertullian, *Apol.* 35.

[15] Tertullian, *ibid.*, 24—*Lædimus Romanos, nec Romani habemur, qui Romanorum deum colimus.*

[16] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii, 12; cf. *Apol.* i, 26.

[17] Origen, *c. Celsum* vi, 40.

[18] Tertullian, *Apol.* 2—*Christianum, hominem omnium scelerum reum deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturæ totius inimicum existimas.*

[19] Tacitus, *Annal.* xv, 44—*Auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat; repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per Iudæam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque.*

regarded the Christians as the cause of every public disaster, of every affliction with which the people were visited:

> If the Tiber rises as high as the city walls, if the Nile does not send its water up over the fields, if the heavens give no rain, if there is an earthquake, if there is famine or pestilence, straightway the cry is, "Away with the Christians to the lion."[20]

Tertullian's words, characteristic of the early Christian apologetic, reveal the animosity against the Christians and also shed light upon the causes of the persecutions of the Jews in later days. The leaders of the hellenistic world charged the Christians with immorality, atheism, and with being disloyal to the state. In time of a great crisis the masses find an outlet for relieving their bitterness against those who are not only unprotected but are considered wicked. The Christians were the scapegoat in the social structure of the ancient world.

As previously, the pagan world continued to despise and fear the Jews. They despised them because they thought them immoral and atheists. They feared them because the Jewish religion had spread in all the strata of the Roman society. In the later period the Christians were likewise despised and feared by the pagans, and for the same reason. They were despised because they were considered wicked and not loyal citizens. They were feared because Christianity had spread and was being accepted in the different classes in the Roman society.

The relation of Judaism to Christianity was not that of a new religion. Christianity in the first century had not yet been crystallized into a religion separate from Judaism. The early Christians consisted mostly of Jews. The Jews looked upon them as *minim,* that is, heretics.

Origen accused the Jews of spreading calumnies against Christianity in the early days. He referred to Celsus as having "acted like those Jews who, when Christianity began to be first preached, scattered abroad false reports of the gospel, such as that 'Christians offered up an infant for sacrifice, and partook of its flesh.' "[21] Tertullian, who, as has been already remarked, also writes at length of these accusations against the Christians, does not, however, hold the Jews responsible for believing in them. Furthermore, Justin Martyr, one of the earliest of the church fathers, who lived a century before Origen, in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, put to him the following question, "Have you also believed concerning us that we eat men; that after the feast, having extinguished the lights, we engage in promiscuous concubinage?" To this Trypho replied, "These things about which the multitude speak are not worthy of belief, for they are most repugnant to human nature."[22] Most likely no such dialogue between

[20] Tertullian, *Apol.* 40—*Si Tiberis ascendit in mœnia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si cœlum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim adclamatur Christianos ad leonem.*

[21] Origen, *c. Celsum* vi, 27.

[22] Justin, *Dial.* 10.

the Jew Trypho and Justin Martyr ever took place. Justin, in order to refute some of the arguments of the Jews and to prove the truth of Christianity, composed the dialogue. He put in the mouth of Trypho those charges which the Jews were bringing against the Christians that he might be able to reply to them. Justin Martyr knew quite well that the Jews never accused Christians of eating the flesh of infants or of any other such crimes. It is true that the Jews persecuted the Jewish Christians but only as their own heretics.[23] They regarded, however, the gentile Christians as of no concern to them. It is possible that some Jews who lived among the pagans heard them bringing such charges against the gentile Christians and believed them since the Jews still regarded the gentile Christians as pagans. The charge of Origen against the Jews of spreading these accusations against the Christians finds no support in the earlier writings of the church fathers.

The animosity against the Jewish Christians was due also to the fact that they disassociated themselves from the Jewish aspirations to establish the Jewish state and even hampered them by reporting the activities of the Jews to the Romans. When, however, Christianity became an independent religion, separate from Judaism, and its adherents consisted mostly of gentile Christians, the Jewish attitude towards Christianity changed. The Christians were no longer considered heretics or heathens. It was recognized that the Christians believed in the universality of God and were not idol worshipers. The laws in the Talmud referring to idol worshipers did not apply to Christians. The talmudists and the rabbis of later periods avowed that the pious people in the various nations would all share portions in the future world. Maimonides was of the opinion that Jesus paved the way for the acceptance of God by the peoples of the world.[24]

The church fathers beginning with the second century advanced the charge against the Jews of crucifying Jesus. Justin Martyr was the first to bring this accusation.[25] The Apostolic Fathers never attributed the crucifixion of Jesus to the Jews. This accusation was brought to the front by Tertullian,[26] Origen,[27] and subsequent fathers. They maintained that God had forsaken the Jews because of their rejection and crucifixion of Jesus. This was the cause of the burning of the temple, the destruction of their state, and their own dispersion among the nations. The charge of the church fathers that the Jews are deicides, the killers of Jesus, has been the battle cry since the second century.

[23] We must bear in mind that when the church came into power it persecuted its own heretics with greater zeal and harshness than that with which the Jews persecuted the early Jewish Christians who were then considered their own heretics.

[24] See S. Zeitlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 97 f.; see note 10.

[25] Justin, *Dial.* 108.

[26] Tertullian, *Apol.* 26.

[27] Origen, *c. Celsum* ii, 8; iv, 22.

When Christianity became the dominating religion in Rome, Judaism was no longer lawful, but merely a tolerated religion. It was called odious, horrible, and abominable.[28] Many laws were enacted against the Jews to prevent the Christians from coming in contact with them and to keep them from becoming superior to the Christians. Constantine prohibited the Jews from owning Christian slaves on the ground that it would be wrong for the Jews to hold in subjugation those whom Christ had ransomed.[29] For the same reason a law was enacted prohibiting any Jew from occupying a court office. The Jews were excluded from military honors and court functions.[30] No synagogues were to be destroyed but new ones were not to be built.[31] The Mishna was suppressed.[32]

In the early period of the Middle Ages, however, the relations between the Jews and the Christians were friendly in spite of the poisoning of the minds of Christians against the Jews by some preachers. In Italy under the Ostrogoths the Jews were well treated. In Spain and in southern France under the Visigoths they were regarded as Romans and were not considered a separate ethnic group. They were allowed free exercise of their religion, and its supervision was vested in the rabbis.[33] Pope Gregory the Great, although very strict in demanding obedience from the Jews to the laws enacted by the Christians, protected them from mistreatment and violence. The leaders of Christianity, however, continued to stress the point that the Jews were responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus and kept alive the doctrine that the blood of Jesus was perpetually upon the hands of the Jews.

Eusebius, Hilary, and Chrysostom in their writings charged the Jews with different crimes. Chrysostom particularly brought violent charges against the Jews. He considered the synagogues dens of idolatry and the abode of devils even though there were no images in them.[34] The Jews, he said, used to murder their offspring with their own hands and were worse than wild beasts. "Even if they no longer murder their own children," he continued, "they murdered Christ which is worse."[35] They did not worship God but worshiped devils.[36] "God hates them," he added in a later section; and indeed he always hated them, but since the murder of Jesus he allows them no time for repentance.[37] These homilies and writ-

[28] *Cod. Theod.* xvi, 8, 1—*nefarium sectam; ibid.*, 19—*perversitatem Iudaicam; ibid.*, 9, 4—*nefanda superstitio.*

[29] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iv, 27.

[30] *Cod. Theod.* xvi, 8, 16.

[31] *Ibid.*, 8, 25.

[32] *Cod. Just.* (Nov. 146).

[33] See Georg Caro, *Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden im Mittelalter und der Neuzeit*, pp. 65-70.

[34] Chrysostom, *c. Judæos* i, 4 and 6.

[35] *Ibid.*, vi, 2.

[36] *Ibid.*, i, 3.

[37] *Ibid.*, vi, 2.

ings in due time poisoned the minds of Christians who came to look upon the Jews not as children of God but as children of devils responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus, for whom there was no repentance unless they accepted Jesus.

In 1096 the first crusade was organized by the Christians against the Mohammedans to retake the Holy City and the Holy Sepulchre. When the crusaders began to march towards Palestine, the chronicle relates that they said, "While we are on our way to recover the Holy Sepulchre and take revenge on the Moslems, we find in our midst Jews who crucified Christ. Let us take revenge on them and destroy the Jews here unless they accept our religion." This determination of the crusaders was a normal reaction resulting from the propaganda of centuries that the Jews were deicides, Christ killers. The crusaders saw the anomalousness and absurdity of the situation. They were going to retake the Holy Sepulchre and die for it while having in their midst the guilty ones who crucified Jesus.

Many of the Christians tried to protect the Jews from the crusaders. Bishop Johannes of Speyer sought to protect the Jews and to punish the crusaders[38] but to no avail. The masses could not understand why they were not permitted to kill the Jews since they had been taught that the Jews were children of the devil, deicides. They were going to fight and die for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre; was there not more reason to kill the Christ killers at home? The demagogues, ready for selfish reasons to incite the masses, incited the crusaders to rob and kill the Jews so as to enrich themselves with their profit.

The mass slaughtering by the crusaders of the Jews because of the belief that their ancestors had crucified Jesus effected a change in the relations between the Jews and the Christians which up to this time had been amicable. With the period of the crusades the dark ages of the Jews actually began. Pope Innocent III, one of the most powerful popes, in his bulla to the archbishop of Sens and the bishop of Paris set forth the policy of the church towards the Jews in the words, "The Jews . . . by their own guilt are consigned to perpetual servitude because they crucified the Lord."[39] Thus the Jews became the servants of the church because of their alleged crucifixion of Jesus. In another bulla he made the following statement, "Thus the Jews, against whom the blood of Jesus Christ calls out, although they ought not be killed, lest the Christian people forget the Divine Law, yet as wanderers ought they to remain upon the earth, until their countenance be filled with shame and they seek the name of Jesus

[38] Julius Aronius, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden*, p. 84.

[39] *Etsi Judæos, quos propria culpa submisit perpetue servituti, cum Dominum crucifixerint*—quoted by Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, pp. 114 f.

Christ, the Lord."[40] He compared the Jews to Cain who had killed his brother Abel and upon whom God had made a sign so that he should not be killed by anyone who found him but should wander from place to place until the end of the world. Like Cain, the Jews also were branded so as not to be slaughtered but to be doomed to wander from place to place. In order that the Christians should be able to recognize the Jews, the Fourth Lateran Council compelled the Jews to wear a badge. The badge was not only to differentiate the Jews from the Christians and to keep the Christians from having dealings with the Jews but to stigmatize them with a sign of degradation. It is true that the badge was not only invoked against the Jews but also against the Saracens, but upon the Jews it produced more disastrous results. Very few Saracens lived in Europe except in Spain while the Jews were numerous and lived in nearly all the European countries. This badge deepened the conviction of the average Christian that the Jews were set apart for their sins to perpetual servitude.

The policy that the Jews were perpetual slaves because of the crucifixion of Jesus was reaffirmed by Pope Gregory IX. In his bulla to the archbishops of France he reiterated the policy of the church that the Jews were not to be destroyed because they were creatures of God whose fathers had been friends of God.

In the centuries after the first crusade various accusations were brought against the Jews besides that of the crucifixion, namely, murdering children for ritual purposes, profanation of the host, and poisoning of the wells so as to kill the Christians. In every great crisis in Europe all kinds of calumnies were brought against the Jews and they were made the scapegoats. As in pagan times when the world was visited by some catastrophe, the demagogues incited the masses to demand, "Away with the Christians to the lion," so in mediæval and modern times, when any public misfortune befell the people, their successors incited the masses to demand, "Away with the Jews to the sword."

It is true that a number of popes refuted many charges and protected the Jews from persecution. Pope Innocent IV said in his bulla that the charge against the Jews of using human blood for religious rites was false since the Jews were prohibited from using even the blood of animals.[41] The good will of Innocent IV and other popes did not materially improve the conditions of the Jews in Europe since for centuries the Christians had been educated by the leaders of the church in the belief that the Jews were killers of Christ and therefore must remain in degradation. Hence any

[40] *Ut esset Cain vagus et profugus super terram, nec interficeretur, a quoquam, tremorem capitis signum Dominus imposuit super eum; quare Judei, contra quos clamat vox sanguinis Jesu Christi, etsi occidi non debeant, ne divine legis obliviscatur populus Christianus, dispergi tamen debent super terram ut vagi, quatenus facies ipsorum ignominia repleatur, et querant nomen Domini Jesu Christi—op. cit.*, pp. 126 f.

[41] Grayzel, *op. cit.*, pp. 268-271.

time a community or a state suffered some calamity, the masses vented their wrath upon the Jews. On the other hand, the policy of the church formulated by Innocent III and Gregory IX, that the Jews must not be destroyed but remain as a living witness of the truth of Catholicism, made it possible for the Jews to survive in the Middle Ages. In many instances it was the church which protected the Jews from total annihilation by various kings, princes, and demagogues.

In modern times full political freedom was granted to the Jews by the French Constitutional Assembly. Later they received such freedom in Holland. This political freedom was granted to them on the principle that the Jews were only a religious community.[42] This emancipation was not entirely successful. Although the Jews were given political rights as a religious group, their religion had only been tolerated and was considered inferior to that of the dominating church. The old accusation against the Jews that they were deicides continued. The masses still looked upon them as Christ killers. This is the reason for the failure of the emancipation. The Jews were emancipated politically but not religiously and hence not socially.

In eastern Europe the hatred against the Jews remained basically unchanged: they were enemies of Christ. When the Russian senate in 1742 enacted a statute to allow some Jews to transact business in Russia because it would greatly benefit the Russian people, the Empress Elizabeth commented in these words, "From the enemies of Christ I do not desire any profit." When Poland was divided among the three states, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, Russia found herself encumbered by a large Jewish population. The Jews were assigned to lived in particular districts. These districts were known by the name "Pale of Settlement." A cordon was put around them. The Jews were not allowed to migrate to the interior except by special privilege. They were also restricted in their professions and were not allowed to purchase any real property in the rural districts. The Karaites,[43] however, were not confined to their domiciles nor restricted in their professions. They had all the privileges which the Russians enjoyed. This was due to the fact that the Karaites maintained and proved to the satisfaction of the czar that their ancestors had not been in Palestine during the second commonwealth and hence did not have any share in the crucifixion of Jesus.

During the reign of Czar Alexander III harsh restrictions were imposed upon the Jews, and they were severely persecuted. Public opinion at that time, even as today, has ascribed these persecutions to the fact that the Jews were socialists. A Jewish girl named Hesia Helfman was an

[42] See S. Zeitlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-116.

[43] A sect within Judaism which accepts the authority of the Bible but not that of the Talmud. This sect arose in Babylonia in the eighth century.

accessory to the assassination of Alexander II. The pogroms that followed were interpreted as public indignation against the Jews. The official version of the cause of the outbreak of the pogroms placed the responsibility upon the Jewish exploiters of the Russian people and to the resentment against the Jewish nihilists. The truth was that the Russian government organized the pogroms in order to divert the public attention from the frightful economic conditions of the country. On March 6, 1890, Baron Horace Gunzburg personally submitted a memorandum to the czar asking him to improve the economic conditions of the Jews and to remove the political and social restrictions imposed upon them. In this memorandum it was made clear to the czar that these restrictions gave the impression to the masses that the government itself was interested in making the Jew a sufferer and a wanderer. The czar did not reply to this memorandum, but he wrote on the margin that it was proper for the Jews to suffer because their ancestors had said, "His blood be upon us and upon our children," and therefore the Jews were destined for suffering. This memorandum was never presented by the czar to the government. It was found in the private archives of the Romanoff family.[44] Thus while the government officially claimed that it imposed restrictions upon the Jews on the grounds that they exploited the masses, this was only a pretext and is repudiated by the words of the czar himself. The czar in his writing on the margin of Baron Gunzburg's memorandum said clearly that the Jews should suffer because their forefathers crucified Jesus.

In 1905 Professor Sergyei Nilus published a booklet, *The Jewish Peril, Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion,* in which he concocted a tale that the Jews were striving to conquer the world. Up to the outbreak of the Bolshevist revolution in 1917 his booklet did not attract any attention. However, after the revolution, it received much publicity.[45]

During the nineteenth century Germany became the citadel of anti-Semitism. A new character was given to the animosity towards the Jews. Hitherto this animosity was of a religious character—*Judophobia.* In Germany it was stamped with a national, racial character and the term "anti-Semitism" was coined. Moses Hess properly evaluated this animosity when he said that the German hated the Jewish religion less than the Jewish race. To understand the underlying reasons which brought about this national racial anti-Semitism we must obtain a glimpse of the German attitude towards the Jews in recent times.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century Germany was not a united nation. She had been defeated and humiliated by Bonaparte. Then came the wars of liberation in 1813-1814. The Vienna Congress which followed

[44] During one of my trips in Russia I made a photostat of this important memorandum.
[45] I shall deal with the *Protocols* forgery in my work on anti-Semitism.

the defeat of Bonaparte did not unite Germany, which consisted of many kingdoms and duchies. In the Jews, the Germans—influenced by the church throughout the ages, which regarded the Jews as a separate *ethnos*, nation—saw a foreign element. The doctrine of race and state as important factors received a stimulus in Germany from the teachings of Fichte and Hegel. This view won many adherents in the forties when the nationalistic movement became popular.

In 1870 Germany became united. After the victory over France Germany underwent a psychological transformation and emerged from the inferiority complex which it had suffered to become possessed of a superiority complex. The seeds of this transformation had already been sown. Nietzsche's idea of superman was eventually appropriated by the Germans and was applied to themselves as a superrace, the master race of the world, *Deutschland über alles*. The Germans advanced the view that the Aryan race was superior to the Semitic race and that the Germans were the leaders of the Aryan race and hence the master race, the *Herrenvolk*. The Germans hence automatically despised those people who were not of the same race and who lived amidst them. They saw in the Jews a danger to their own race. The religious attacks against the Jews, however, did not cease. These attacks were lumped together with the racial and national.

In 1871 Rohling published a pamphlet, *Talmud-Jude*, in which he brought together the wildest and most malicious falsifications against the Jews and Judaism. He repeated the same charges previously brought by Eisenmenger.[46] The doctrine of racial anti-Semitism was brought to the front by Wilhelm Marr in his pamphlet, *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanthum*, where he asserted that the Jewish question was really a race question. He maintained that the Jew had no ideal religion, that his religion was materialistic. He regarded the Jews as a definite Semitic tribe whose purpose throughout the ages was to subjugate all the European peoples, particularly the Germans. He was the first to introduce the term *anti-Semitism* and organized a society of anti-Semites. In the same decade Adolf Stocker founded the Christian Social Labor Party, a Jew-baiting party. Stocker as well as Marr preached the doctrine that the Jews were of an alien nature and thus harmful to the German state.

The historian Treitschke in his pamphlet, *A Word on Our Jewry*,[47] maintained that the Jews were a nation and that Germany could not contain a double nationality. Hence he held that the Jews should leave Germany. He said that they might establish a Jewish state anywhere outside of Germany. He severely criticised the Jewish historian Graetz for his

[46] Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum* was first published in 1700.

[47] Heinrich von Treitschke, *Ein Wort über unser Judenthum*, 1881.

method of writing the history of the Jews. Treitschke claimed that Graetz showed that he was not a German. He did not think as a German. He merely lived in Germany. Theodor Mommsen[48] defended the Jews by saying that they were Germans like Treitschke himself. Nevertheless they found no solution for the Jewish question in Germany except by baptism. Moses Hess, being a Jew, knew apparently more of the German character than did the German historian Mommsen. Hess said that baptism would not help the Jews of Germany. The hatred against them in Germany was racial.

In their conception that they were a master race and superior to all other races the Germans were greatly disturbed by the fact that Jesus whom they worshiped was flesh and blood of an inferior race, a son of the Jewish people. Houston Stewart Chamberlain in his two volumes, *The Foundation of the Nineteenth Century,*[49] reeking with pseudoscholarship, tried to remedy this situation by showing that Jesus was not a Jew but an Aryan.[50] He also maintained that the Jews were not a religious group but a definite nation and that their religion was vicious. The theory that Jesus was an Aryan certainly could not gain popularity among devout Catholics and Protestants. The gospels lay stress on the point that Jesus was a scion of the family of David. The Messianic idea in the New Testament is based on the Hebrew prophets who were believed to have prophesied that Jesus, the Messiah, would suffer and be resurrected.

Treitschke said that the Jews were a misfortune. Later nationalists followed up this view with the claim that Christianity also was a misfortune to the Germans. It was not enough to demand, "Away with Judah"; it was necessary to continue, "Away with Christ and Christianity," since neither Christ nor Christianity can be separated from Judaism. This pagan idea had already been recognized in antiquity. Tacitus tells us that Titus, the conqueror of Jerusalem, had the same idea when he said, "The Christian has grown out of the Jew. If the root were destroyed the stalk would easily perish."[51] The pagan of the ancient world, like the pagan of the modern world, realized that to destroy Christianity one must first destroy Judaism. The primary aim of anti-Semitism is to destroy the Jews and Judaism, but ultimately it is out to destroy Christianity as well. Alfred Rosenberg, the apostle of Nazism, followed Nietzsche in his doctrine that Christianity was a religion of slaves.[52] He held that neither Protestantism nor Catholicism expressed the

[48] Th. Mommsen, *Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum.*

[49] Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts,* 1919.

[50] Cf. his words (*op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 256): *Die Wahrscheinlichkeit, dass Christus kein Jude war, dass er keinen Tropfen echt jüdischen Blutes in Adern hatte.*

[51] Tacitus, *Hist. Fgm.* 2—*Christianos ex Iudæis extitisse; radice sublata stirpem facile perituram.*

[52] *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts,* p. 93.

soul of the Germans. "We must create a German Christianity," he said.[53] It is readily understandable that the Germans, with their artificial superiority complex of master race, would not tolerate Judaism or Christianity. Both of these religions are universal and preach the equality of men, good will to all men on the earth. Christianity and Judaism held that all were equal before God and there should be no distinction between Hellene and Jew. Nazism replaced the cross with the swastika. Nazi Germany wanted to establish the old pagan national god, the god of the Nordics, instead of Jesus. If the Nazis were to succeed in this war, not only would Judaism be destroyed but Christianity as well. Hitler would become the pontiff of the Nordic god and Rosenberg his apostle.

We have in this rather concise survey shown that the root of the hatred against the Jews was the teaching that they were deicides. Even in Germany, when anti-Semitism as a national racial hatred against the Jews was introduced, the doctrine that the Jews are deicides continued to spread. The success of anti-Semitism was accelerated because the Jews were hated centuries before on the grounds that they were Christ killers. They were a marked people. They were different.

In Germany, as well as in many other countries including our own, many Christians, both Catholics and Protestants, in order to combat anti-Semitism organized societies of good will towards the Jews and declaimed against religious bigotry and racial hatred. They certainly do help to establish a better relationship between Christians and Jews. Some Christian ministers, in order to improve the good will between these two religions, have been preaching sermons in their churches against religious and racial hatred. This is bound to improve the relations between the Christians and the Jews, but only temporarily. We must not forget, however, that even the minister of the gospel, while preaching good will in the church towards the Jew, on solemn occasions preaches and teaches one of the doctrines of Christianity which is that the Jews crucified Jesus, that the Jews are deicides. This doctrine is repeated on every occasion, every week, particularly during Holy Week and on Easter. It is taught in the schools to the children. Thus the minds of the children are already poisoned in the schools and later in the churches, and no sermon of good will by any Jew or Christian can prove an antidote to this poison. The Jew is always a Christ killer.

[53] *Das alte syrisch-jüdisch-ostische Kirchentum entthront sich selbst: ausgehend von einer Dogmatik, die den seelischen Baugesetzen des nordischen Abenlandes nicht entsprach, im Bemühen, die allein tragenden und kulturschaffenden Ideen der nordischen Rasse—Ehre, Freiheit und Pflicht—beiseitezuschieben oder sich botmässig zu machen, hat deiser Vergiftungsvorgang schon mehrfach zu schwersten Zusammenbrüchen geführt. Wir erkennen heute, dass die zentralen Höchstwerte der römischen und der protestantischen Kirche als negatives Christentum unserer Seele nicht entsprechen, dass sie den organischen Kräften der nordisch-rassisch bestimmten Völker im Wege stehen, ihnen Platz zu machen haben, sich neu im Sinne eines germanischen Christentums umwerten lassen müssen. Das ist der Sinn des heutigen religiösen Suchens* (Bk. I, Chap. 2, § 8).

Organized good-will societies may temporarily remove the danger of anti-Semitism. However, in times of crisis demagogues are always ready to exploit for their own advantage any dissatisfaction in society, and it is easy to enrage the masses against the Jews, a *marked people* known as Christ killers. Some demagogues may present the Jews as communists, some as international bankers, and others as international Jewry, whichever may best suit their designs. Good will in times of great crisis cannot stand up again the age-old accusation against the Jews. To believe that such organizations as good-will and antidefamation societies can eradicate anti-Semitism is illusory. The Jews have been defamed too long.

The question then confronts us: Can anti-Semitism ever be eradicated? The answer is: Yes, it can in time if Christians are really interested in combatting anti-Semitism, which is a cancer gnawing at the vitals of civilization. Although the Jews are the real victims of this disease, ultimately it will become a pestilence that will strike at the Christians as well. We do not mean that textual emendations or changes should be made in the New Testament in respect to the crucifixion of Jesus. The New Testament is holy for the Christians as the Hebrew Bible is holy for the Jews. What we hold is that the Apostles' Creed which was recited in the early days of Christianity and is still recited in many Protestant churches, should be reinstated.[54] In this creed it is not stated that the Jews crucified Jesus.

The present pope, Pius XII, who is a great humanitarian, has from time to time interceded for the Jews. His predecessor, Pope Pius XI, in one of his encyclicals said that in spirit we are all Semites. In reinstating the Apostles' Creed the leaders of the church would perform an act of good will for the church to its Jewish mother religion. In the early days of Christianity, as well as in the Middle Ages, the authorities of the church maintained that the Jews by their suffering were a living testimony for the truth of the church. The church now no longer needs a living testimony for its existence. It is well established.

The early leaders of the church as well as the early leaders of the synagogue committed errors. The old differences should be buried. A good will, not an artificial one, should be established between the church and the synagogue.

The idea of nationalism has always sought the separation of one people from another people. Throughout history up to our own day nations have fought one another. The ultranationalism which developed in Europe due

[54] I mean that the Apostles' Creed should be reinstated in the churches and the schools where it is taught that the Jews crucified Jesus. As to who were to be blamed for the crucifixion of Jesus, see S. Zeitlin, *Who Crucified Jesus?* 1942.

to the last war was largely responsible for the bloodshed which is raging now among different nations throughout the world. More than two thousand years ago the prophet Isaiah had a vision that the time would come when no nation would raise a sword against any other nation. This prophecy is far from being fulfilled. However, in our own time the best minds of every nation are still occupied with the idea how to prevent war between nation and nation, between fellow men and fellow men. For this purpose they advocate the establishment of a league of nations in which all the nations should take part in order to reconcile their differences, not by the sword but by justice.

In antiquity when nations had their own national gods they fought in their battles. When a nation was the victor, the god was the victor. When a nation was vanquished, the god was also taken into captivity. Judaism and Christianity—and other universal religions, too—fought against the idea of national gods. According to Judaism and Christianity there is only one God, the Father of all humanity. Judaism and Christianity both fought against the distinction between nationalities and races. All are children of the Creator. There is no difference between race and race before God. He is the Supreme Being of the entire universe, the Creator of all mankind.

It may be still but a dream to have a league of all universal religions to work for equality of mankind regardless of race and brotherhood of humanity, but someday this dream may be realized.

WHEN YE PRAY

HERBERT H. STROUP
Brooklyn College

BETWEEN private and public prayer there would seem to be "a great gulf fixed." The desired spontaneity which is utilized in private prayer must necessarily be modified, if not largely lost, in public praying, for the person who intends to lead prayer holds a responsibility not alone to the honesty and freshness of his need but also to the aspirations and emotions of others. The purpose of public prayer, therefore, is definitely centred upon the construction of those words and phrases which will gather together the thought life of the group in a common worshipful experience. That this is so, imputes important characteristics to public prayers which are not so highly possessed by private prayers. What, then, are the aspects of public prayer which the minister should bear in mind in constructing his group prayers? While not all of the significant traits will be mentioned, a few which come to mind may prove of aid:

1. *The public prayer demands meticulous and painstaking care in preparation.* No longer, as if we ever really did, can the minister depend on "the movings of the spirit" for his inspiration in public prayer. The preparation of the public prayer must involve a critical analysis of detail, for only a carefully prepared prayer will do honor to an intelligent and high-souled congregation. The public prayer is not "canned" because it is prepared faithful to the moment's demands in a period some time previous to its delivery. A parishioner said of a Boston preacher of another day that his prayers were the finest "that were ever delivered to a Boston congregation." Prayers are supposed to go further than the congregation, but unfortunately some do not get even that far. If the prayer seeks to be worthy of the person voicing it and of the congregation attempting to make it its own, and if the prayer seeks to be more than a homily delivered to a Christian group, it needs especially to be well planned and well executed.

2. *The public prayer has a theme.* The prayer which rambles from the "high God" at the beginning to "my Aunt Bess" at the end fails to attract serious worshipers. One theme is usually enough for one prayer. The well-constructed prayer is like a fugue of Bach's which starts with a basic pattern and develops and elaborates the basic pattern for the length of the composition. The single idea needs to be stated in old ways and new ways indeed, but always with deliberate intent to say the single thing.

3. *The public prayer involves group experience.* In one sense, it is

difficult for a public prayer to include private experiences because these are not generally and sharply relevant to the group consciousness. Public prayers which seek to be private in their emphasis often result in a boring recital of names, dates, and places. The prayer leader who begins mentioning the relation of any person of the community to the Deity (such as the President, the mayor, the high school principal, old mothers, etc.) is bound to do a grave injustice to all those special groups and individuals which he does not mention. Special groups and individuals, however, may deftly be used by the prayer leader if they lead to the formulation of some rich group experience for the persons engaging in the prayer. Otherwise, the mere recital of names, etc., may stir the members of the group to "sit out" that part of the prayer.

4. *The public prayer needs originality.* The private prayer may involve no conscious striving for fresh formulations of emotions and convictions; the public prayer thrives on its creativeness. Public prayer is difficult, among other reasons, because it involves a "three-way traffic." That is, the public prayer is oriented toward the group, toward God, and from the prayer leader. For the leader to try to maintain communication with the group is a formidable enough task, but, when the group does not hear the words of the leader as ends in themselves but as a symbolic stimulation toward self-striving toward God, then the task of the prayer leader calls for abounding ingenuity and limitless provocation. The "old" phrases are not always sufficient to arouse the group member to exceed himself and his own mental interests at the time, although an old phrase may do the trick if it is embedded as a furbishing element in the framework of a living appeal.

5. *The public prayer is brief.* The private prayer may be as long as the interest of the person praying endures. In the public prayer, however, there is the problem of "compounded personal interest." In public prayer the leader cannot be sure that his interest span is identical with all his followers'. Perhaps a fairly humane rule to follow in public prayer is: the prayer should never exceed the supposed interest span of the listeners. The fact that ministers so seldom sit in the pew during church services may blind them to the fact that the interest spans of most congregations are lamentably brief—a few minutes at the most. More and shorter prayers are better than fewer and longer.

To frame the problem in a different fashion, by way of summary: The effective prayer leader will be diligent in his preparation of prayers; he will say one thing in many ways; he will capitalize on the experiences of those in the group; he will travel fresh pathways to the high places of religion; he will have his say briefly.

CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS

OSCAR W. HENDERSON
Baptist Institute for Christian Workers

In an old chronicle of the Plymouth settlement titled *New England's First Fruits* (London, 1643), is found this summary of Puritan aims:

> After God had carried us safe to New-England, and wee had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our liveli-hood, rear'd convenient places for Gods worship, and settled the Civill Government; One of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance *Learning,* and perpetuate it to Posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to our Churches when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust.

In a new edition of Tolstoy's great stories there is an introduction written by Dorothy Canfield Fisher, one sentence of which made an instant appeal to me. It is this: "The terrible gift of familiarity has never hidden their beauty, so full of strong and tender meaning, from our fickle human eyes." The more you reflect upon the order of events and interests set forth in the lines of the old chronicle of the Puritan group, the more you admire and appreciate the logic or the good sense of their acts—first, homes; then the necessities of life, places of worship, civil order. And now they dream and long for a school "to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity." What was the result of this dream? Long before the first boy born on American soil of Puritan parentage had reached the age of admission, the church had set in operation a movement to start a college for him to attend.

In 1636 the Massachusetts Bay Colony made a gift of £400 to inaugurate such a school, and several years later a nonconformist preacher by the name of Harvard gave half of his library and rather more than £750. This marked the beginnings of Harvard University. In 1932 Harvard had an endowment of $110,000,000. May familiarity with the story of the Puritans never lessen our sense of gratitude to them for giving a pattern to America which did so much to shape the life of our people before we separated in matters of government from the Old World and for having produced men of heroic mold to shape our new world.

A different story must be told about my cavalier ancestors in Virginia. They were very busy fox hunting, distilling choice liquors, dancing, courting the ladies, enjoying long periods of leisure. However, through the persistent efforts of the Reverend Doctor James Blair, a distinguished Anglican, King William and Queen Mary gave their approval and blessing to the beginnings of William and Mary College. To receive a land grant from the king and to name the college after the reigning royal family

insured the success of the college. The good and learned Dr. Blair lived long enough to see this college accepted with great favor in Virginia. But note this fact: William and Mary College was established in 1693 at Williamsburg, Virginia—the colonial capital—fifty-seven years after Harvard. It too was a church school. Today it is a state-controlled institution and widely known because it is the centre of the restoration project financed by Mr. Rockefeller.

The establishment of Harvard and William and Mary marks what Dr. Tewsbury, of Columbia, calls the first period of college life in America. There follows a second period; and in this period we have Pennsylvania, Princeton, Columbia, Rutgers, Brown, and Dartmouth. Dr. Sweet, of the University of Chicago, in his recent book, *Revivalism in America,* states:

> Strange as it may seem to those who think of revivalism only in terms of ignorance, superstition, and an exaggerated emotionalism, there is a very close relationship between the history of higher education in America and revivalism.
>
> Of the nine colonial colleges, the six [mentioned above] had some relationship either directly or indirectly to the great colonial religious awakenings. Previous to the colonial revivals, only the two established Churches—the Congregationalist and the Episcopalian—had founded colleges.[1]

The revivals, as Sweet properly emphasizes, so added to the numbers of the dissenter group that all this educational advance was possible in terms of men and money. Princeton, then called the College of New Jersey, was the child of Presbyterian revivalists and was established in 1746, 110 years after Harvard. The first five presidents were outstanding revival preachers. George Whitefield had a most important part in the movements toward the beginning of three of our colonial colleges. He is regarded as the indirect founder of the College of Philadelphia, and his name is mentioned frequently among those who started Princeton and Dartmouth. It was during this second period of educational advancement that the established church and the dissenters opened academies to search out young men of promise for the ministry and send them on to the colleges. In four of our histories of colleges there are lively accounts of the great demand for an educated ministry. Between 1780 and 1830 forty colleges were established. Presbyterians had thirteen of these to their credit; four were founded by Congregationalists, one by the joint effort of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, six by Episcopalians, three by Baptists, one by Catholics, one by German Reformed, and eleven by the several States. The Presbyterians were the only group to go beyond the Alleghenies prior to 1830; they were instrumental in getting two States to establish schools.

[1] W. W. Sweet, *Revivalism in America,* p. 147.

Beginning in 1820 and continuing until the Civil War period, we have the story of how Methodists and Baptists challenged the Presbyterians and Congregationalists and started in real earnest to do something about this important concern of the people. Up to this time there was not a single college established by the Methodists. They had some schools which had been started by Asbury, but these were not of college level. But between 1830 and 1861 the Methodists had established thirty-four colleges. The Baptists had four colleges in 1830; by 1861 they had twenty-five, while the Disciples, the Quakers, and the United Brethren had respectively five, two, and one. Of the colleges founded west of the Alleghenies during this period the majority were fostered by the revivalists. Oberlin is a notable example. One of its early presidents was Charles G. Finney.

That higher education should be democratic rather than aristocratic was largely a contribution of the revivalistic churches, namely, Baptist, Methodist, and Congregationalist. And it was their multiplication over the land that was responsible for the decentralizing of educational facilities and for making colleges available for all, especially for the frontier people. About 1831 there was organized a "Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education in the West." Before this society at its annual meeting in Cincinnati in 1835 Lyman Beecher spoke. His cry was: We must educate or we will perish by our prosperity. If we do not educate, short will be our race from the cradle to the grave. If in our haste to be rich and mighty, we outrun our literary and religious institutions, they will never overtake us. The destiny of the West is the destiny of the East. Such is a partial story and a hurried glimpse of our educational heritage. Our educational institutions established prior to 1861 were established by the denominations or by States and societies guided largely by the clergy. There were only seventeen State colleges prior to 1862.

In 1862 came the passage of the Land Grant Act and the beginning of a larger concern by the States for higher education. The State university or college is a virtual newcomer in the field of higher education in America, for during the early years of our national life—prior to the Revolution and for many years thereafter—the preferences of our people in America were clearly on the side of the church-controlled schools. At the turn of the eighteenth century there was some agitation for a greater number of state-controlled schools. This was due solely to the ferment of opposition to clerical control. Opposition to clerical control is credited to the influence of the French Revolution. There can be little denial of the fact that 1862, the date of the passage of the Land Grant Act, marks the beginning of strong competition between church-related schools and State schools. And who among us is yet sure of the outcome? We have

seen many of the church-related schools shift over to control of self-perpetuating boards of trustees and a steady movement toward private corporation control.

The first colleges were established for the purpose of maintaining a scholarly ministry, as explicitly stated in the charters of Harvard and of William and Mary. Such colleges as these gave training to the majority of the great men—both clergy and laity—who were responsible for the formation of the republic and for the cultural refinement of the early life of the nation.

The trend of the church-related colleges to private or corporation control is still on and is growing to great proportions. Do our leaders lack vision? Would it not be better to say that education has become an American passion and has outrun the religious control? Many of the schools had sufficient financial support and prestige to warrant an early declaration of their independence of church relationship. Many others could not wait for the denominations to answer their calls for money to plan expansion and to meet educational competition. The ear of the church was heavy; so it could not hear. Its charity was leaden, and it gave too little; and the little it did give came too late for the patience of college administrators and trustees and alumni groups. All of the nine precolonial and colonial colleges have moved away from clerical and church control. Of the 162 colleges now remaining which were founded by the various denominations prior to the Civil War, 148 have become independent of church ties.

Many of the colleges prior to 1862 were born of great emotional moments in the life of the church, but the churches failed to translate emotional concern into the more substantial things, such as money and students. Of course, the denominations could not give money equal to the lavish hand of the States, and so state-controlled schools have gone far beyond anything in physical equipment which we may dream for our church-related colleges. The great private institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago—to mention but a few—alone can compete with the University of New York, Michigan, Ohio, and other State universities.

Many questions are asked, and asked repeatedly, such as: Is the church justified in pouring its financial resources into small institutions, when many of them are weak and decidedly second-rate? Is there any ethical obligation resting upon parents who send unsuspecting and obedient children to schools which lack such physical equipment as laboratories, large libraries, dormitories, and fraternity houses, and which live perilously near the line of educational respectability, often unable to give the children

advantages equal to the advantages of the larger private and state-controlled schools?

Personally, I feel I owe ever so much to church-related colleges and seminaries and there is no question in my mind that many readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY likewise share in this emotion of gratitude. Many of us were guided to such schools by our pastors or Christian elders who believed strongly that our spiritual welfare would be guarded in church-related schools and that such schools would supply us with an educational equipment equal to State schools or privately controlled colleges.

What may be said for our church-related colleges today? "What do they more than others?"

Dr. Schwartz, chancellor of Nebraska Wesleyan University, recently said that both in normal and abnormal times leadership in social adjustment has come from the church-related colleges. He argues that the church is responsible for most of the reform movements in the last several centuries, that the leadership of the church has been the leadership of such movements, and that such leadership has come from the church-related colleges. The church-related college has been closely identified with the stream of prophetic vision and vigor which has flowed down through the centuries in the channel of the Hebrew-Christian tradition.

Not only the pulpit — the particular product of church-related schools—but the classroom of the church-related college has provided a sounding board for the prophetic messages of Amos, Micah, Hosea, Isaiah, with the prophetic and stirring messages of McConnell, Rauschenbusch, Steiner, Elwood, Ross, Silver, Ryan, and a host of others equally effective. To all this the idealism of youth responded. And so youth went out to leaven society with the ferment of constructive, social ideas.

To this we must add there has been some sharp criticism and obstructionist tactics by trustees and alumni and patrons of education towards the McConnells *et al.*, and that not a few eminent teachers have been casualties even in church-related colleges. But we have had casualties for cause in the University of Wisconsin, of Michigan, of Pennsylvania, and more recently of Texas. And there have been notorious examples in Georgia under Gene Talmadge and in Louisiana under the fiery Huey Long. You can't satisfy all trustees in theology or economics. But we have a London newspaper's facetious quip of about a year ago. In commenting on a theological treatise by the Archbishop of Canterbury, it evinced a strong dislike to the great leader by saying that the archbishop would be well advised to let theology alone and to stick to his economics.

The chancellor of Nebraska Wesleyan stressed the worthy thought that church-related colleges in the main had sought and had succeeded in giving students an underlying faith in the ultimate triumph of decency and

goodness in the social order, and a practical working knowledge of a Christian program of social and economic betterment. The student has gone forth with an awareness of need and an ability to recognize social abuses.

Dr. Aubrey, of Crozer, had an article in *Religion and Life* several years ago in which he spoke this word for the church-related college: "To the Christian college falls the special task of clarifying the meaning of a Christian society and training potential leaders in the attitudes required to make them capable of public service in terms of Christian ideals and faith."[2] In other words, the church-related college relates its whole program of guidance without apology to frankly religious ideals—loyalty to the will of God, loyalty to the kingdom of God—for such ideals of guidance are more dynamic, more moving factors, than any other appeal.

Another good word to be spoken for the Christian college is that it does possess many teachers who radiate qualities and graces that are the direct results of genuine Christian living. To be sure, there are some faculty members who are only nominally religious and a few—but a very few—who are cynical or hostile to religion. Then we have in our church-related colleges a fair percentage of faculty members who have time and disposition of heart to give themselves to student relationship and fellowship. In the smaller colleges of this group there is much wholesome personal contact between students and faculty, and this is certainly no small benefit to students.

We have long since known that the greater number of our ministers came from the church-related colleges. The last survey to determine the source of our ministerial supply was taken two years ago. It shows that the seminaries of the nine leading Protestant denominations register eighty-five per cent of their students from church-related schools. This survey revealed several interesting facts: namely, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians report that they are receiving a larger number of ministerial students from the State schools. Dr. Cotton, of the Chicago Presbyterian Seminary, stated that he found that a good number of such men had been directed to the ministry by Presbyterian student pastors in the universities. Bishop Angus Dun, formerly dean of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge reported that many came from privately endowed colleges and that fully twenty per cent of their students came from State schools. On the other hand, Gordon College of Theology and Missions reported that their school had not had a student from a State college in twenty-five years and Southwestern Baptist Seminary said that they had fewer students than ever from State

[2] "Do or Die: The 'Christian' Colleges" in *Religion and Life*, X, 4 (Autumn, 1941), pp. 586-594.

schools. This survey would indicate that greater interest through student pastors in State and privately endowed colleges can be helpful and that the appointment of a larger number of such men to serve in all State schools is a good investment of the church.

A secretary of one of our well-known foundations—a foundation that has done much for higher education in this country—expressed the conviction that if church-related colleges remained loyal to their distinctive purpose and mission in higher education, they would lack today neither students nor funds. In this connection it may be recalled that in a recent issue of the *Reader's Digest* it is reported that H. L. Mencken has a form letter which he sends to all who write him in disagreement with his books, editorials, or articles. It is this: "Dear Sir, you may be right."

Whether the secretary of the foundation is right or wrong—personally, I think he is wrong in his diagnosis; the States pour millions into their schools—one thing is certain. Our church-related colleges face a trend which is not favorable to their future. One thing is sure: Education cannot be sectarian, nor should it be. There is a future for the small liberal arts college, whether it is church related or not, for the sole reason that it is small and that there is still a segment of our population interested in such schools.

I must not fail to say that we are greatly stimulated by the present program of our Board of Education to set up agencies of helpfulness for our Baptist schools of the Northern Baptist Convention. The character of the service in the field of public relations is most assuring and heartening and the stimulus to secure funds for the schools is quickening interest and deepening our confidence.

We should keep our minds alert to the proposed compulsory military service act, for it will probably place heavy emphasis upon R.O.T.C. courses in all colleges as a way out for students who wish to avoid the service of one year in the military or naval forces of our country. And R.O.T.C. means money and perhaps greater control by the state over all schools of higher education. Who knows?

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

It is safe to say that there are few, if any, more universally admired passages in all literature than I Corinthians 13. Together with the Golden Rule it comprises what might be styled the all-time "Shortest Bible" for a not inconsiderable group who are ever-ready to assert that most of what is threshed over in the churches is of no slightest concern to intelligent men (which in many cases is entirely true) and that all a man needs to do is to "follow these" and he "will be all right." But for many others who do not so rigorously limit their spiritual vitamins it is also a particular favorite. And now that many nonliturgical churches no longer limit the responsive reading to the Psalms, it is frequently made use of in that section of the service in which pulpit and pew indulge in a sort of impromptu give and take. Parenthetically it might be remarked that the structure of this particular chapter is by no means adapted to this type of Sunday morning exercise.

But familiar though the passage is, it is also safe to say that many of its accustomed phrases are scarcely more than just that, phrases which we are fond of. "Speaking with the tongues of men and of angels"—what, if anything, does that mean to the rank and file who repeat it today? But that was far from the case in Corinth. When these burning words were read aloud on the arrival of the letter from Ephesus, how furious many of the saints must have been at this blasphemy. And the "sounding brass and clanging cymbal"? Fortunately the latter is today permitted by the Revisers to *clang* instead of being forced to *tinkle;* to how many does the din suggest the cacophony against which the apostle protested? And how about "seeing through a glass darkly"? If the purpose of translation is to make the image present in the one language live in the other, here is surely a sorry failure.

Perhaps the most obscure word of all is verse three: "And if I bestow all my goods to feed *the poor,* and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing." In most writing, italics are used to indicate points for especial emphasis. In the Bible they are, of course, used for a very different purpose, namely, to indicate what the translators think was implied but not expressed in the original. So here. The words, "the poor," are not present in the Greek, and it is far from certain that Paul had them in mind. The words literally translated are "If I crumble up all my possessions into morsels of food." The word, *psōmizō,* was commonly used of putting bits of food into the mouths of babies and young animals, and eventually came to be used of "feeding." But the absence of any indication of those to be fed—"the poor" is sheer conjecture; Paul is surely thinking of

the giver, not the recipients—makes it far from unlikely that the word is here used not in the sense of turning one's possessions into food for the purpose of feeding anyone but absolutely, of crumbling them, that is, getting rid of them.

And this possibility is heightened by the next clause, the meaning of which is also far from certain. The King James reads, "and though I give my body to be burned." This is substantially reproduced by the American Revised although with a warning in the margin, "Many ancient authorities read *that I may glory.*" This marginal reading has points of impressive strength. Although the two readings in English are quite dissimilar, in Greek the difference is trifling, simply the matter of one consonant—*kauthēsŏmai* and *kauchēsōmai.* Although many editors prefer the former common reading, they all recognize the superior textual, not to mention the syntactical, strength of the latter. It is attested by the two oldest and, on the whole, most trustworthy manuscripts which we have (B and Aleph), which when supported by each other—and in this case by several other significant manuscripts, versions, and quotations in the Fathers—are never lightly to be disregarded. And Westcott and Hort, editors whose caution and sobriety are not to be gainsaid, printed the reading *kauchēsōmai* with no marginal variant and defended their judgment at this point with a judicious and weighty argument well worth pondering. Nor were they alone among modern scholars. W. Robertson Nicoll in the *Expositor's Greek Testament* strongly favors the marginal "that I may glory," as did Dean Stanley. The *Twentieth Century* reads "that I may boast," and Goodspeed accepts it, rendering it crisply "but do it in pride."

It has been suggested that the clause, "if I give my body," is incomplete and needs to be rounded out with some such phrase as "to be burned," while "that I may glory" would be a strange sort of conclusion. Actually that argument is not impressive. We feel the need of a phrase to round out the words, "if I give my body," largely because of the seemingly parallel "to feed the poor" in the earlier clause. As already remarked, this element in the King James, which apparently is to be ascribed to Tyndale, perhaps because the Latin versions regularly read *si distribuero in cibos pauperum,* is quite unjustified by the Greek. Thus the impression that something is lacking after "give my body" is probably fictitious. And surely, "that *I* may be burned," for so *kauthēsŏmai* must be rendered—the paraphrase, "to be burned," obscures this awkward feature—must strike every thoughtful reader as surprising. A few late manuscrips sought to remedy this infelicity by reading "that *it* may be burned" (*kauthēsetai*), while still others attempted to get rid of the solecistic future indicative or the monstrous future subjunctive by substituting the first aorist passive *kauthē.*

To conclude a matter which if properly treated would require a far more technical discussion than is possible in this editorial, it would appear that Paul was not referring to self-immolation on a funeral pyre—most certainly not to a fiery martyrdom which would in his day, though not a few decades later, seem distinctly anachronistic—but to a complete surrender of self. Thus the words following "give my body" do not refer to that clause alone but to both elements in the sentence: "If I surrender all that I have, if I even give up my body, all for the sake of glory, not because of the constraint of love, it gets me nothing." Was he thinking of those who actually had sold themselves into slavery? Such cases are not unknown. Was he thinking of his own career where he had given up all that was dear to him—a proud heritage and standing—which might easily lead to the figure, breaking into crumbs all that he had; and not only that, but of the life of voluntary hardship which had scorned support or assistance from those to whom with justice he might have looked, and which had brought him more than once to death's door? Few will deny the possibility. When we realize that this whole chapter is not simply a pretty little effusive lyric on love, as most discussions of it in the pulpit which I have heard would unfortunately suggest, but is rather a stinging and pointed attack upon his opponents who are arrogantly claiming for themselves precisely these ecstatic gifts of the spirit which he is here subordinating, and who are so utterly blind to those other qualities which make for love and evidence its presence and without which life as he has come to know it is completely pointless, it may not seem unlikely. In fact, it may well give a fresh cutting edge to words gone blunt through years of careless handling.

From Off the Campus and On

THE AUTHOR of the leading article in this issue prefers to remain anonymous. This is not to escape criticism for the views expressed. There will probably be little of the latter, and the writer is case-hardened. Rather he prefers, and rightly, to let his essay make its own case; and we shall be surprised if many do not consider it a strong case. Sherlock Holmes once remarked: "To underestimate one's self is as much a departure from truth as to exaggerate one's own powers." He was right. And to any who might hastily conclude that this essay was an attempt to sing his own praises from the housetops—if the CROZER QUARTERLY can be so styled—his refusal so to do should be a complete answer. The principal facts about him are self-evident: an honest, straightforward, and rightly honored minister of Jesus Christ. His name would likely be known to most of those who read these pages, quite regardless of their denominational allegiance. But his refreshing candor and obvious honesty do not need the support of a well-known name.

Dr. Fogg's brief essay is timely. It draws attention to an aspect of a much discussed problem that will continue to be overlooked only at the peril to sound learning. And there are few more competent to raise the question. For several years Dr. Fogg was dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and director of the College Collateral Courses of the University of Pennsylvania; last July he became vice-provost. Thus he knows at first hand of what he writes. Nor is his view solely that of the administrator. He is also a botanist of eminence, whose field work and activities in research have made him a recognized authority in his field of professional competence. He holds earned degrees from both Pennsylvania and Harvard.

Professor Hyde is a frequent and welcome contributor to our pages. His essay, "The Popular Religion of Greece and Its Survivals" (April, 1941), was widely read if letters to the editor can be trusted. His current article on the religion of the Romans is an appropriate sequel. For many years Dr. Hyde was a professor of ancient history in the University of Pennsylvania. His retirement from active teaching has simply provided more time for his continued and fruitful research in his chosen field.

This issue's right to self-introduction belongs to Professor Hightower:

My days at Crozer were numbered from 1927 to 1931, at the end of which time a B.D. and a Th.M. (or, is it M. Th.?) had been allowed. Also, the University of Pennsylvania granted an A.M., and later in 1933, the University of Chicago yielded

up a Ph.D. Before Crozer I had been three years abroad, most of the time teaching at Foochow College, a middle school in Fukien, China, associated with the A.B.C.F.M. (Congregational). At Crozer I was "one of those southern boys" from the University of Richmond who still liked hot biscuits. In addition to teaching and preaching I have worked some in the field of social work. My family and I have resided in Kalamazoo since 1934, at which time I became head of the department of sociology at Kalamazoo College. Last summer all of us had a pleasant stay on the Crozer Campus.

It is a particular pleasure to welcome Professor Zeitlin to our pages, Readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY will remember his spirited reply (April, 1944) to one of his critics. One of the world's great talmudic scholars, he is deeply interested in the field of early Christianity, in which field he has written much. Among his many writings may be mentioned his essays on Josephus; a series of studies, "The Crucifixion of Jesus, Re-Examined" (which served as the nucleus of his volume, *Who Crucified Jesus?*); and a series of essays, "Judaism as a Religion," now appearing in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, of which he is the distinguished editor. Professor Zeitlin was born in Russia, was educated in St. Petersburg and at the Sorbonne in Paris. He holds the degrees of Rabbi and Th.D. from the École Rabbinique and Ph.D. from Dropsie College, of which latter he has been for years a member of the faculty. His well-documented and restrained article will be read with interest and understanding.

Herbert H. Stroup is an instructor in the department of sociology in Brooklyn College. He is a graduate of Muskingum College, Union Theological Seminary, and the New School for Social Research. He has also been on the staff of several churches in Metropolitan New York. Recently he edited a volume, *A Symphony of Prayer,* of which the present brief paper is perhaps an echo.

Dr. Henderson became president of the Baptist Institute in September, 1943, after nearly five years as executive secretary of the Detroit Baptist City Mission Society. For eighteen years he was minister of the Grace Baptist Church in Trenton, New Jersey. During this latter pastorate he was president of the New Jersey Baptist Convention and for four years vice-mayor of Trenton. He is a graduate of Wake Forest College and of Crozer Theological Seminary. Wake Forest conferred a doctorate upon him in 1937; Crozer is proud to have him as one of her trustees.

Our book reviews continue one of our prides. Again we present a good grist of reviews from competent reviewers. Dr. Aubrey is the president of Crozer and a professor of theology. Anton T. Boisen, a member of the Council for Clinical Training, is a supervisor at its training centre at the Elgin (Ill.) State Hospital. Dr. Davis is a professor of theology at Crozer. Professor Donovan was for many years, until his recent retirement, head of the department of Old Testament at Andover Newton.

Dr. Enslin is professor of New Testament at Crozer. Dr. Fineshriber is rabbi of Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia. Dr. Franklin, president *emeritus* of Crozer, is now residing in Richmond. Dr. Garber, formerly dean of the Divinity School of Duke University, is now bishop of the Geneva Area of the Methodist church. Mr. Grey is minister of the First Congregational Church, Woburn, Mass. Dr. Haupert is president of the Moravian College and Theological Seminary. Professor Jones is a member of the faculty of education at the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Keighton holds the chair of homiletics at Crozer. Dean Knudson, now *emeritus,* was for many years head of the Boston University School of Theology. Professor Matthews was for a quarter of a century professor of Old Testament at Crozer. Mr. Morey is the supervising principal of the Swarthmore (Pa.), public schools. Professor Otto is a member of the department of philosophy of the University of Wisconsin. Professor Outler is a professor of theology at Duke University. Dr. Rose is minister of the First Baptist Church, Philadelphia. Dr. Saunders is headmaster of the Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J. Professor Thomas, for several years a secretary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, is now professor of practical theology at Crozer. Mr. Westphal is minister of the Lansdowne (Pa.) Baptist Church.

TWO REQUESTS

Our supply of back numbers of the following issues of the Crozer Quarterly (January, 1924; January, 1925; January, 1929; October, 1929; April, 1930; July, 1930; October, 1930; January, 1931; April, 1931; July, 1931) is exhausted. This prevents our filling orders from libraries for complete sets of the Quarterly and also incidental orders. The Crozer Quarterly will purchase a limited supply of such numbers, at twenty-five cents each. If you have such for sale, please communicate with the business manager.

Scarcely a week goes by that copies of the Quarterly are not returned by the postal authorities with such annotations as "Address Unknown." Many of these are from men with the armed services. To insure prompt reception of your copy, please keep the business office informed of your correct *current* address. The Crozer Quarterly will do all in its power to get your copy to you; mind reading is not one of our achievements.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness, by Reinhold Niebuhr, New York, Scribner, 1944, pp. xiii, 190, $2.00.

There are people who love to feel immersed in the world's profundities. They prefer the sense of knowing to knowledge and the "problematic thrill" to solving problems. They are all ears to hear the innermost secret of history, but are bored by the multiplicity of historical facts. They want oracles, not insight. This book should be to their liking.

Students of logic, too, should find its pages diverting. Pronouncements covering the significance of men's activities through centuries, through ages, are freely set down without evidence to support them. The thoughtful conclusions of such mature persons as Sidney and Beatrice Webb, or John Dewey, are lightly dismissed in disparaging footnotes. Social movements, political theories, national programs assume the character of personified entities; they think, they plan, they push people around. Hypostatized generalizations, reminiscent of Oswald Spengler, stride through the chapters as "inescapable forces of history," exercising "the power of historical destiny over human decisions." What a good time Stuart Chase might have going through this book to collect additional examples for his *Tyranny of Words.*

Is it for anybody else? Yes; for the type of person who is satisfied to have his beliefs endorsed regardless of the quality of the endorsement. According to available records, Jesus cared for human beings. His sympathy went out to mankind, even to publicans and sinners. The author of this book thinks ill of his fellow mortals. He finds it difficult to entertain generous thoughts of even the best of them. But there are doubtless certain Christians who will gladly overlook this misanthropy, if they happen to notice it, since Christ is spoken of in highest terms. Moreover, the faith is expressed that all historical forces are driving mankind toward a Christian world community, and that historical achievements take on meaning when one knows "their completion to be in the hands of a Divine Power, whose resources are greater than those of men, and whose suffering love can overcome the corruptions of man's achievements, without negating the significance of our striving"; and although this view is not integrated in the argument as a whole and is not supported by any testable data, it is clearly announced in the concluding words of the book, and this will be found sufficient by those who want that conclusion regardless of how it is obtained.

And what is the central message of this series of lectures on the Raymond W. West Memorial Foundation at Leland Stanford University? That the failures of democratic civilization have been and are due to an overoptimistic view of human nature. We have not appreciated the extent or the power of man's inherent self-love; we have not detected the "corruption of self-interest in all ideal achievements and pretensions of human culture." There are "children of darkness," the "moral cynics, who know no law beyond their will and interest," and "children of light," those "who seek to bring self-interest under the discipline of a more universal law and in harmony with a more universal good." The former, enemies of democratic civilization, are malicious, but realistic and wise; the latter, its friends, are idealistic, but stupid and sentimental. "Our democratic civilization has been built," says the author, "not by children of darkness but by foolish children of light. It has been under attack

by the children of darkness, by the moral cynics, who declare that a strong nation need acknowledge no law beyond its strength. It has come close to complete disaster under this attack, not because it accepted the same creed as the cynics; but because it underestimated the power of self-interest, both individual and collective, in modern society. The children of light have not been as wise as the children of darkness."

If this is the disease, what is the cure? It is the control of egoistic human nature by a power adequate to the task. This means, for one thing, that the problem has to be seen realistically. "A sober approach to the world situation must begin," according to the author, "with the assumption that the initial basis of unity for the world must be laid in a stable accord between the great powers." Only "the preponderant power of the great nations can be an adequate core of authority for a minimal world order." But the power envisaged by realism is not in itself sufficient. The power of moral idealism is required to prevent self-seeking individuals and nations from pushing on to dictatorial imperialism, intensifying the conflict between peoples, and resulting finally in social chaos. In addition to various outer checks and balances to prevent egoism from running wild, these "realistic" checks must themselves be subjected to an inner moral check. From this it follows that man's salvation must be sought in an absolute, superhuman power, since this alone is strong enough to control the might of dictators, nations, and empires. And that is how we are brought to this conclusion.

The understanding of the Christian faith that the highest achievements of human life are infected with sinful corruption will help men to be prepared for new corruptions on the level of world community which drive simpler idealists to despair. The hope of Christian faith that the divine power which bears history can complete what even the highest human striving must leave incomplete, and can purify the corruptions which appear in even the purest human aspirations, is an indispensable prerequisite for diligent fulfillment of our historic tasks.

A book abounding with pronouncements would have to say something now and then both true and important. And an author of marked ability and wide experience could hardly cover so vast a territory without here and there enlarging the vision of his readers. Besides, subjects are emphasized which are vital to democracy as a social arrangement, such as the problem of achieving richness of individuality in harmony with communal maturity. Nevertheless, it is my considered judgment that anyone, Christian or non-Christian, who reads these two hundred pages seeking light on the profound questions now troubling democratically inclined men and women will be disappointed just to the extent that he wants to understand rather than to feel. We are not living in ordinary times. The whole human venture is in grave danger. It is a time which urgently calls for imaginative understanding of human motivation and the most responsible kind of thinking about social and political reforms. This book gives us neither.

At that I personally found the manner more disappointing than the matter of the discussion—the pontifical neglect to define crucial concepts, such, for example, as the "self"; the typically academic (in the bad sense) and highly abstract method of analysis; the tiresomely reiterated assertion that so-and-so "does not understand," that such and such a view is naïve, superficial, fatuous; the attitude of intellectual superiority toward practically everyone else who has expressed an opinion on any relevant subject. It is true that the virtue specifically approved is "religious humility," but I failed to discover the spirit of humility anywhere about, while I could have sworn that repeatedly I heard Anthony Trollope's Tom Towers, who "walked on from day to day, studiously striving to look a man, but knowing within his breast that he was a god."

M. C. OTTO

The Romance of the Ministry, by Raymond Calkins, Boston, Pilgrim Press, © 1944, pp. xiii, 253, $2.00.

Chronicle of an American Crusader, by Samuel S. Mayerberg, New York, Bloch, 1944, pp. xiii, 148, $1.50.

A certain lewd fellow, having been invited to attend church, declined, giving for a reason his reluctance "to listen to something of little moment being spoken by nobody in particular." The reviewer, being a preacher, is content to let others judge whether this criticism might justly be urged against the run of sermons heard in our American churches. Out of his own experience he can but say that he has occasionally heard men of considerable intellectual stature belabor a matter of slight importance in the pulpit; that more frequently he has listened while little men have wrestled (God knows why) with themes beyond their preaching powers; that now and again he has been present when a preacher who was somebody in particular dealt happily with matters of highest importance.

These reflections raise the question whether Phillips Brooks' definition of preaching is now adequate. Brooks defined preaching as "truth uttered through personality." In the days when he preached this description was acceptable. Then the pulpit could assume that the pews, being filled with a knowledge of and a reverence for Christian truth, were eager to be shown where that truth might be applied to the glory of God. A man of any proportions who had something to say that his congregation already knew could expect a hearing. Today, perhaps unfortunately, the preacher must create whatever eagerness is to enliven his congregation, for as much as the people know not the truth. The man, not his message, is the spearhead of the sermon. Effective preaching might, in our day, be defined as personality uttering itself in some truth. Only the preacher who is able to commend himself—without conscious effort, of course—as "somebody" by virtue of talent or character may hope to be heard.

Each of the men whose books are here under review is a "somebody" in his own right; each has something to say that is of more than slight importance. Their ministry has rested on a foundation of personality wedded to truth.

It would be difficult to find two ministers who, in the accidents of birth and training, environment and experience, are more widely separated than are Dr. Calkins and Rabbi Mayerberg, or two who supplement each other more nicely. The first is a New England Congregationalist, the second a Midwestern Jew. One, an evangelical preacher in the best sense of that term, has spoken throughout his ministry directly to the individual conscience, yet never without reference to the social implications of his Christian gospel. The other, a social reformer, who, without overmuch encouragement, fought the corrupt political machine of Kansas City, was never neglectful, one feels sure, of the claims of personal religion on the lives of individuals under his care.

It is time to say that *The Romance of the Ministry*, written during the years since Dr. Calkins retired from the pastorate of the First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Massachusetts, is less hortatory than conspiratorial in tone. It seems to say, "Come, young man in the ministry, let me show you how to integrate your scattering powers for doing the central task of your ministry so that the work may bring you endless delight"; and that *Chronicle of an American Crusader* is in the narrative style, as the title suggests, being the account, up to date, of a career which, God grant, has not yet reached its zenith.

Here, then, are two books to read in close sequence. Though they differ in their

emphases, they are in no respect contradictory. Together they present a rounded concept of that manifold ministry which religion, engaging the various talents and special interests of its ministers, ought always to discharge. In reading *The Romance of the Ministry,* one who knows Dr. Calkins can see the man himself moving behind the pages, his personality inviting confidences and confession, his presence emanating courage and hope, his sermons commending themselves to mind and heart no more by their own authority than by the robust manhood of the preacher. Yet, back of the man and the individuals whom his sympathy attracts one discerns the New Jerusalem growing, stone by stone, upon the earth.

I regret that I do not know Rabbi Mayerberg, save as the *Chronicle of an American Crusader* reveals him. He writes of his unusually effective social ministry with modesty and restraint; yet he cannot wholly conceal himself behind the garment of the God of righteousness whom he serves. If the reader sees him first as an Elijah walking unafraid into the court of Ahab and thundering under the window of Jezebel, he knows him at the end as a Jeremiah who entreats the souls of his people by the tender mercies of the Eternal.

What strikes one most forcibly in the reading of these two books is the fact that in each instance the writer stands forth as a man who all through his ministry knows what he is doing and why he is doing it; which is something, it may be, that too few ministers know about their office.

It is impossible to think of either Dr. Calkins or Rabbi Mayerberg interpreting his ministry in terms of next Sunday's sermon. Yet, that is precisely what many ministers do. They are content if somewhere between Monday morning and Saturday evening they can hit upon an idea—any idea: theological, ethical, sociological, literary, nationalistic, or even globolonic—that can be dressed up so that it will hold the attention of the congregation for twenty minutes. So to preach is to put the ministry on the level of the magazine which boasts of its national circulation. Even to do this kind of preaching so well that it builds a large congregation does not necessarily place the minister above Jack Benny or Gracie Allen who also have a large and steady hearing.

The books under review, without actually saying so, make it plain that a sound ministry must have an over-all purpose worthy of the mind's sweat and the soul's blood. The preaching which is something more than a Chautauqua course, which consciously strives to bring up a generation from childhood to Christian maturity, or to build a church that will be troublesome to the ungodly in the community, or to transform the community itself so that it becomes a precinct of the kingdom of God is the kind of preaching which justifies a man's ordination. When a minister repudiates the occasional and the expedient in favor of a central objective for his preaching and all his other work, he puts himself in the way of becoming an integrated person. Conscious then of a creative purpose which runs through the years and demands always his best, he enters, even here on earth, into the joy of his Lord.

ROBERT MUNSON GREY

The Cross and the Eternal Order: A Study of Atonement in Its Cosmic Significance, by Henry W. Clark, New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. xiii, 319, $2.50.

The title of an earlier book of Dr. Clark's, *Liberal Orthodoxy,* will serve to characterize the general method and temper of this present work, if it be clearly understood that the noun commands more weight than the adjective. In *The Cross and the Eternal Order* we have an original and contemporary exposition of an

"orthodox" doctrine of the atonement which avoids, for the most part, the dogmatic accent and its accompanying "theological wrath." Clark knows and acknowledges that, whereas the *fact* of atonement is basic and common in all classical Christian theology, the *mode* or *manner* of Christ's atoning work is an open problem, concerning which legitimate differences of view have always obtained. In confidence and humility, therefore, he has given us a book which, for those who can accept his basic assumptions, will prove interesting, provocative, rewarding. For the others, it will at least furnish a fine example of a forthright, reverent, and devout confession of faith.

The "standpoint" from which Clark would approach his problems is nothing less than "the standpoint of God" (chap. I). This aspiration sounds more grandiose than it is. Actually, it is an overemphatic way of insisting that "atonement" is not simply a subjective, human affair, but that it is, primarily, an act and process of God himself: atonement is God's problem as well as man's. Man's sinfulness has blockaded God's original creative movement. Atonement is thereby made necessary. Its intent is to restore the pristine relation twixt God and his human creatures, so that man may resume his moral and spiritual *itinerarium in Deum*. The cross *and* resurrection are God's answer to his own problem, as well as his provision for man's ineluctable need; they signify a changed means to an unchanged goal.

In the development of this high theme, there is an excellent chapter on the nature of "forgiveness of sin" (chap. III) and a trenchant critique of all those mechanical and forensic doctrines of "saving faith" which so often turn out to be little more than assent and acquiescence in "Christ's saving deed" (chap. VII). Magical, mercantile, and submoral notions of atonement and propitiation are ruled out and, with equal vigor, so also are all shallow moralisms. Instead, Clark proposes and expounds an interesting and original version of Paul's "Christ-mysticism." In the atonement man is confronted with Christ's claim to the lordship of his life; the response of faith—faith, obviously, in the Pauline sense—effects "an exchange of personalities with Christ" (pp. 210 ff.).

Such a doctrine of the identification of the believer with Christ requires a thoroughly Christocentric theology, and this Clark undertakes to supply. He finds the basis for interpreting "atonement in its cosmic significance" in what he calls "the Pauline synthesis": *Christus Creator, Christus Immanens, Christus Redemptor.* Greek theology, or so he thinks, forgot everything save *Christus Immanens;* Latin theology, we are told, dropped out all but *Christus Redemptor.* To understand and hold the three notions together "leads to a theology which is not only philosophical and evangelical, but evangelistic as well" (p. xii). It is easy enough to agree that Clark's theology is evangelical and evangelistic, but it gives one pause to think it philosophical. Indeed, it would have strengthened the central contentions of the book if the attempt to fit "soteriology into a philosophical scheme" (p. xiii) had been left off. The handling of philosophical and historical problems is casual, to say the least, and contributes little to the really original and insightful portions of the theological essay. A philosophical theology is a great desideratum, but it cannot be produced merely by discussing philosophical issues in a theological vein.

This book will find divers critics. It is too mystical for the rationalists; too rationalistic for the neo-orthodox; too orthodox for the modernists. Nevertheless, it deserves to be taken into account. For just as surely as the lively contemporary discussion about the nature of man leads (as it certainly now appears) to a deeper recognition of the human dilemma and the futility of all schemes of self-salvation, so surely will the question about salvation-through-Christ become more acute and insistent. If there is any "good news" in the Christian message, it is that Jesus

Christ's life, death, and resurrection have made *the* crucial difference in man's hopes and destiny. Clark's book is a pointer-reading, an important datum for further reflection upon this luminous mystery. And, as Dr. C. H. Dodd so aptly observes in his foreword, it is a book which shows everywhere "the touch of a wise and deeply devout spirit."

ALBERT C. OUTLER

The Bible and the Common Reader, by Mary Ellen Chase, New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. xi, 316, $2.50.

This little book modestly professes to be designed for the common reader. Its object is guiding that individual into a better appreciation of the Book of Books. To do this it exhibits attractively the fascinations of the greatest of books. The author is Miss Mary Ellen Chase, the distinguished professor of English literature at Smith College. Her previous publications have delighted thousands with the charm of her style, her keen insights and sympathetic understanding of human motives. All these are now brought into play to induce the reader to experience for himself the literary power, the dramatic impulses, and the subtle human contacts found in the Scriptures. To her other equipment the author adds a deep religious feeling refreshing in such studies. Her literary judgments are made with the discrimination of the expert. Apparently she has two aims. The first is like Dr. Fosdick's in his *Guide* for "the interested student" who is perplexed in the clash between new discoveries and traditional views. The second aim seems even more cherished, to win the common reader to an interest in the English Bible and so help to restore it to its primacy in our literature. In both cases her means is the exhibition of the literary and dramatic qualities of Scripture. The methods of the book have been wrought out in years of experience with college classes. At this point one may query whether Smith College girls are "common" readers. Not when they are under Miss Chase's inspiring leadership and direction. This opinion finds support in her own statement of her reason for writing: "Like many another enthusiast for one thing or another, I want the fun of explaining that enthusiasm and, perchance, of inculcating it."

Four very valuable introductory chapters are followed by sparkling comment on books and groups of books in the Bible. This is far from a mere book-by-book résumé of contents. The author avows her use of the principle of selection. Her fondness for the dramatic and personal leads to a treatment of individual characters with mention of the material which tells of them. There are many allusions to passages of outstanding merit in English and classical literature. The comparison with the material under study is most stimulating. The many types of biblical literature are noted with sufficient quotation to illustrate each topic. The discussion of the poetry of Job and the Psalms is especially fine. The introductory chapters tell what the Bible is, pay tribute to the King James translation, give an admirable sketch of the history of the Hebrew people in biblical times, and describe the racial and literary characteristics of this people. Probably no two historians can agree on all details. For a brief general picture, in touch with the latest research, the chapter on history is excellent. Any minister or theological student may profit by it. While the author is unwilling to be counted a theologian, she gives many valuable side observations on the growth of Old Testament religion. Illuminating comment on the circumstances of the various writings is generally in harmony with the most modern investigations. Some of us who agree with Miss Chase on the dignity and beauty of the King James translation will yet be surprised at the rather cavalier treatment of recent text criticism (p. 25). It is a bit curious to find one so keenly awake to

twentieth-century thought on higher critical opinions snuggling down so contentedly in the lower criticism of the seventeenth century.

Miss Chase finds the New Testament inferior to the Old in general literary quality. She notes that it occupies only about one third the space of the Old Testament. She restricts her discussion to less than a quarter the space accorded to the older collection. Yet it is this smaller division of the Bible which gives supreme value to the whole. It discloses the basis for the Christian faith. Offsetting her estimate of the New Testament as a whole, Miss Chase has warm praise for much in the writings of Luke and Paul and for the Apocalypse. One feels a sharp disappointment to meet no treatment of the literary and dramatic characteristics of the teaching of Jesus. Surely the Sermon on the Mount and the parables are not merely the production of Matthew and Luke, but reveal the methods of the Master of the Words of Life. The dramatic features of the Old Testament personalities have been thrillingly presented. One misses the expected picture of the most dramatic personality. It is strange, too, that only the life and teaching of Jesus are mentioned as the topics of the New Testament writers. The three especially praised all stress the death of the Christ. He is the crucified one who is alive again. At least one common reader misses further reference to the Gospel of John. It is frequently remarked that in the Gideon Bibles in hotel rooms the most read portions are the Psalms and the Gospel of John. Presumably the hotel guests are common readers. Are they mistaken in their selections?

As a tribute to the literary excellence of the Bible this volume deserves highest praise. Its perusal will bring to any minister new insights and promote better public reading of Scripture. Lovers of the Bible will be glad to know that the students at Smith have such instruction. They will welcome the contribution to a renewed appreciation of the English Bible. Most of all they will hope that it reaches the common reader, whoever he is, and wins him to the author's enthusiasm.

W. N. DONOVAN

How to Think of Christ, by William Adams Brown, New York, Scribner, 1945, pp. xxi, 305, $3.00.

The volume carries the interesting subcaption: "A book for people who feel there is more to be found in the Lord Jesus Christ than they are able to understand." At once the mood of the book is set forth in those words. There is no studied attempt by the author to plumb all the depths of Christ's personality and present us with a neat and complete answer concerning the secret of his remarkable life. On the contrary, it is frankly recognized that the church has never been able to resolve the mystery of his person in which there are two natures, a human and a divine. Dr. Brown places great emphasis upon this fact, pointing out in clear language that the fathers who met at Chalcedon and drew up the Chalcedonian creed were unable to clear up the riddle of his person. Satisfying different theological interests then dominant in the life of the church, they said that in Jesus there was a complete union of the human and the divine natures, but yet, at the same time, the persistence of a difference between them. How these opposite positions were to be reconciled remained unstated. "All that they decided was that any man who could affirm both union and distinction had a right to his place in the Church" (p. 59). What they said in effect was that there is more in Christ than we can comprehend.

This book is particularly rich and rewarding to the reader because of its sympathetic appreciation of the many ways in which men have approached Jesus and sought to understand him. Some have come to him through the pathway of the

intellect alone. Among these are the theologians, the philosophers, and the historians. Their answers to the problem of Jesus Christ have generally failed, bringing little of joy, and life, and light to those who peruse their pages of explanation. Their failure is rooted in the fact that while Jesus is one who appeals to the whole personality of man—to his imagination, affection, will, and intellect—they have unduly concentrated upon the rational implications of Jesus for humanity. Their solutions have not satisfied the great masses of the Christian community.

A second group of answers to the richness of Jesus' life is found in those which supplement reason by authority. Here are to be found the lawyer's Christ, the Christ of the clergy, and the soldier's Christ. All of these represent the voice of the Christian society speaking to supplement that of individual theologians, philosophers, and historians. In truth, we should say that these represent the voices of the various churches within Christendom, for many of them have set forth a final answer to the problem of Jesus Christ which they have accepted as peculiarly true. The lawyer's Christ is enshrined in Roman Catholicism's claim that the pope is the vice-regent of Christ and hence is the final authority not only in matters of religion, but of state as well. In Protestantism, the lawyer's Christ emerges in the theory that Christ died on the cross to satisfy the justice of God. His punishment will be accepted as substitute for the sins of the faithful. The Christ of the clergy is the one who, for the devout Catholic, actually comes to him through the sacraments dispensable only by the church, while for the Protestant he is the one who speaks his word in the Bible. The soldier's Christ is the one who aids his followers in their incessant conflict with evil. He, too, is recognized by the church, both in its Roman Catholic and Protestant phases.

Yet the answers of the intellect plus those supplemented by authority have not been sufficient to express what men have found in Jesus Christ. Many have felt that the fullness of Jesus could not be captured by, or looked up within, a mental formula or an ecclesiastical institution. So they have gone out upon adventures of their own with Christ, finding their answers to the richness of his life through the imagination, the will, and the heart. Here we find the artist's Christ, the Christ of the disciples, and the Christ of the saints. The artists have used their imagination through canvas, marble, cathedral, and musical score to tell us their feeling about Christ. In him they have found a superhuman beauty brought into time. The disciples have approached Jesus through the will, trying to follow his example in the daily walk. The saints, on the other hand, have come to Christ through the affections, revealing to us what it means to fall in love with him.

In the concluding part of his work, Dr. Brown emphasizes that Jesus brings the distant God near to us. He finds history to be the meeting place of time and eternity and in its course, most of all in Jesus, God enters the stream of humanity's life. He sums up his own personal faith by stating that "Jesus is the window through which we see as much of God as it is given finite man to see" (p. 282). While this affirmation cannot be proven, it has none the less been central for Christian thinking across the centuries. His aim in writing the present volume, says Dr. Brown, "has been an attempt to discover what is involved in that affirmation" (p. 282). That he has found many and varied expressions of that affirmation is abundantly confirmed by the wide scope of the book.

Many will gratefully accept this book—published posthumously and edited by Henry P. Van Dusen—as a fitting climax to a long and productive Christian life. For many years to come it will undoubtedly be a volume which students and laymen interested in the Christological problem will find of great significance.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Encyclopedia of Bible Life, by Madeleine S. and J. Lane Miller, New York, Harper, 1944, pp. xvi, 493, $4.95.

It is far too early to assess the war's full impact upon biblical studies. However, with excavations severely curtailed, much attention has been devoted to the fuller study of unpublished archæological materials. Furthermore, the need on the part of the nonprofessional biblical student for authoritative reference works which he can understand has probably never been more clearly realized by professional scholars than at the present time.

The authors of the *Encyclopedia of Bible Life*, according to the jacket of their volume, have made nine trips to the Eastern Mediterranean in the years preceding the war. The work which they have written shows very clearly that they have read widely and diligently in the most recent archæological materials. They are personally acquainted with some of the leading scholars. The illustrations, largely their own photographs, which cover one hundred pages, are of excellent quality. However, in spite of commendable features, the *Encyclopedia of Bible Life* cannot in any sense be recommended as either reliable or authoritative.

From cover to cover, there are inaccuracies of many varieties. The Arnon is described (p. 14) as "cutting across the earth's deepest-valleyed depression, the Ghor, to join the Jordan." As a matter of fact, the Arnon flows not into the Jordan, but into the Dead Sea approximately twenty-five miles south of the Jordan's mouth.

The authors refer to the pyramids of Menkaure and Mycerinus (p. 84), unaware that these names are variant forms of the name of one pharaoh. In the bibliography on p. 87 *The Bearing of Archæology on the Old Testament* is credited to George L. Livingston instead of to George L. Robinson.

It is erroneously implied (p. 136) that the entire Sinuhe story is recorded on a Cairo ostracon, whereas only the beginning is there recorded. It is also implied that the Cairo ostracon is of ceramic ware, whereas Breasted describes is as "a large flake of limestone."

Tell en-Naṣbeh is identified with Bethel (p. 115). In spite of the fact that Tell Beit Mirsim is commonly connected with Kirjath-sepher, the authors refer to loom weights found at Tell Beit Mirsim and at Kirjath-sepher (p. 353).

The authors are specific in stating that the Siloam inscription was found at the point where the two working parties met underground. Actually, the inscription was found nineteen feet in from the lower end of the tunnel.

The head of the Sphinx is said to be sixty-six feet high (p. 116), whereas the usual figure for the breadth of the face is thirteen feet six inches. It is rather misleading to state (p. 378) that the pyramids "are intact except for surfacing looted long ago." Actually the pyramids were robbed of their royal treasures many centuries ago. Similarly, it is misleading to state (p. 70) that Petrie found "the earliest Hebrew script at Serabit."

Herod's Temple is said to have been completed in a year and a half (p. 392); and Rehoboam II (p. 395) to have been ruling *ca.* 750 B.C.. The Virgin's Fount is equated with the Pool of Siloam (p. 236). Emmaus is identified with Abu Ghosh without question (p. 409). The threshing floor of Ornan is described as a scarp (p. 44). The Dead Sea is nearer to fifty miles in length than forty, and is thirteen hundred feet deep rather than twelve hundred feet (p. 225). Merenptah is assigned (p. 387) the years belonging to Ramses II.

The style is frequently unclear, lacking precision. In what sense, for example, is Thutmosis III to be considered a "loyal" (p. 11) ruler? or Breasted a "humanistic orientalist" (p. 67)? or Megiddo the "Gettysburg" (p. 229) of the Jewish people?

or Ras Shamra (p. 114) a Ugaritic centre? Why the expression "the 18th Dynasty B.C."? or the phrase "art furniture"? Artemis of Ephesus (p. 451) is described as "the many-busted lewd Diana."

One wonders why a section devoted to baths, hospitals, palaces, prisons, tombs, and the like is entitled "Social Structures." This section is introduced with a description of the "Seven Wonders of the World," which are considered "social structures" because each "had a socially beneficial mission," and includes the pyramids of Gizeh.

The authors seem at times to be unaware of the distinction between the modern name of an ancient city and its ancient name. Thus, to the authors, "it seems strange that Tell-el-Amarna is not mentioned in the Bible" (p. 170). In most cases, the land of the Sumerians is called Sumeria. In one instance, reference is made to the "Sumerian-Accad people." Generally, pre-exilic Hebrews are referred to as Jews.

Treatment of the professional archæologist often borders on the sentimental. Leading archæologists are referred to as "major stars," and as "heroes." Glueck is called an "ardent expert." Scholars are said to "tingle" with expectation. While the viewpoint of the authors is generally objective, one wonders on what basis it can be stated (p. 152) that "Hebron will also prove to contain corroborative material when excavated."

Among the rather numerous slips in proofreading are: "ethmology" for ethnology; "Ugartic" for Ugaritic; "torquoise" for turquoise; "parablic" for parabolic; "irrigated plans" for irrigated plains; "Garstung" for Garstang; "Egpytian" for Egyptian. Jerusalem is said to be 3,8000 feet above the Dead Sea. It is to be noted that the maps of Jerusalem place En-rogel at the site of Gihon. The index is far from being complete and will limit the usefulness of the volume.

It is to be regretted that a work which is likely to circulate as widely as the *Encyclopedia of Bible Life* was not more carefully reworked before publication.

RAYMOND S. HAUPERT

The Ten Commandments in a Changing World, by Isaac Klein, New York, Bloch, 1944, pp. xviii, 141, $1.75.

Chaplain Klein's little book on the Ten Commandments consists of ten chapters composed in the classic manner of Jewish homilies. With great skill the author makes illuminating comment on the ethical principles embodied in each of the Commandments, elaborates them with striking illustrations from rabbinical literature and with keen observance on their relevancy to modern life. In this book Rabbi Klein continues the age-old tradition of the Midrash, which is a homiletic interpretation of the words of Scripture, especially of the Pentateuch. It is written in a fluent style easily comprehended but with sufficient content to intrigue even the well-informed student of the Bible. But its greatest value lies in the profound understanding of the spirit of the Bible and of rabbinical literature. The author has a thorough knowledge of the Jewish sources and uses them with great skill and discernment. The Christian theologian and preacher will be very grateful for the many citations from rabbinical sources which, alas, are not easily accessible to him, and which provide a deeper understanding of the spirit of Jewish literature.

To illustrate: his treatment of the concept of God in the sermon on the first Commandment. He quotes the Midrash as follows: "Come and see how the voice of God went to each Israelite, and to each one according to his powers; to the elders according to their strength, to the young people according to their grasp, and even to Moses according to his powers of comprehension" (Exod. Rabbah, chap. 5, § 9).

The author continues his comment: "The character and nobility of one's conception of God is determined by each one according to his powers, according to his experience, his mental capacity, and a spiritual insight. . . . We can only urge that men do not stop short but continue their inquiry and their search for the reality of God in human experience, and offer a few suggestions that may be helpful."

His comment on the second Commandment is worth quoting: "Midrash expresses this concept beautifully," said Rabbi Levi. "God appeared to them in the manner of a picture that seems to face in all directions. A thousand people look at it, and it seems to look into the direction of each one. Just so, when the Holy One, blessed be He, spoke, every Israelite said, 'To me the Lord spoke.' That is why it is said: 'I am the Lord Thy God,' in the singular, and not 'I am the Lord your God,' in the plural. The intimation is that the worship of God finds expression in many ways. The voice of God reaches us through various channels."

Another illustration emphasizing the same truth: "A simple man came to Rabbi Israel Baal Shem (the founder of Chasidism) and complained. The command of the Torah is: 'This book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night' (Josh. 1:8). How could a man in his circumstances fulfill the command? As a poor man he had to work hard and long in order to sustain his family. He felt grieved that his time could not be devoted to the meditation of the Law as commanded. The Rabbi smiled and answered: 'My son, you misunderstand the meaning of the commandment. You can worship God not only by attending divine services or by the study of the sacred books. Whenever you do that which is right, you worship God. If you are a merchant and you give an honest measure, you worship God. If you treat your fellow men kindly, you worship God. In that manner every one of us has it within his power to worship God the entire day. The businessman at his counter, the laborer in his workshop, the teacher in his classroom, and the professional man in his office, serve God and their fellow man when they perform their tasks honestly.' The simple man went away pleased. He, too, could serve God day and night."

In his sermon on the ninth Commandment the author applies the spirit of this Commandment to some of our modern problems. It is worth while that I quote a portion of this very interesting and inspiring sermon:

> The mayor of a New England town was asked to speak at the dedication of a Hebrew school. On the morning of the dedication he called the rabbi on the phone to discuss with him the burden of his talk. The rabbi was astonished at the following outline of the projected speech: As mayor, he welcomed the opening of the institution. Since most Jews were Communists, this religious school would help to correct their error and bring them back to religion. The rabbi was aghast. He mentioned to the mayor that at the last elections (1936) there were 80,159 votes cast for the Communist candidate in the Presidential elections, although there were 4,500,000 Jews in America. Where were the rest of the Communist Jewish votes? The mayor countered that the leadership, then, of the Communist party was Jewish. In answer the rabbi mentioned the names of the people who occupied the top positions in the party. There were practically no Jewish names. The mayor was amazed at this information. This particular executive was a graduate of a distinguished university, head of a large industrial establishment, and even progressive in his political views. Yet it had never occurred to him to investigate the facts. Unfortunately, this attitude is typical of thousands of people from whom we have the right to expect a more intelligent and more just approach.
>
> The claim that the Jews control business and industry is an argument of the same color. What Jew has not been confronted with the accusation that Jews control all the capital? *Fortune Magazine* conducted an investigation to find out how much of the industry and finance of the United States is controlled by Jews. The findings bear out what people who look for facts have always known, that the alleged Jewish dominance in these fields is pure myth. These facts are available to all who wish to know the truth. The studies of other fact-finding organs lead to the same conclusion. The Jews occupy a comparatively minor position in the very fields they are claimed to be dominant. From Poor's Financial Records it would appear that even in New York City the Jewish directors of banks form 3.31 per cent of the total. In the retail business they

have 5 per cent. The much touted control of the press dwindles down to 3½ per cent. Why do not people who have a pretense to education go to the facts? Their failure to do so is the most flagrant form of bearing false witness.

The temptation to continue quotation is strong, but I refrain because I should like to have many people read this valuable little book if they wish to gain an insight into Modern Judaism and its relation to life. Chaplain Klein has used his distinctive talents in preparing a book which will be of great value, not only to Jews but to Christians who wish to gain an insight into the spirit of an ancient faith.

WILLIAM H. FINESHRIBER

Pioneers in World Order: An American Appraisal of the League of Nations, edited by Harriet Eager Davis, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. x, 272, $2.75.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a general international organization have so absorbed the minds of people concerned for international peace that we are in danger of overlooking the lessons of past experiments and the various treaties already in force. These must both be reckoned with if we are to be realistic and effective.

The book under review is invaluable because its authors examine the successes and the weaknesses of the League of Nations as a background for understanding the present problem. But we have here no post-mortem, for the League is not dead by any means. Forty-five nations are still making their contributions for its continuing work. Several hundred treaties are still in force under it, which must either be denounced or incorporated into any new agreements. Technical services like those of antidrug enforcement, the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the International Labor Organization are still being maintained.

What shall we do with these in relation to the new plans now being advanced for international security, disarmament, mandates, economic supervision, treatment of refugees, intercultural coöperation? Experts like James T. Shotwell, Manley O. Hudson, Carter Goodrich, Arthur Sweetser, Herbert L. May, and James G. McDonald discuss these and related problems. The result is a most enlightening array of facts and presentation of principles for our guidance in thinking our way through the postwar years.

Four alternative possibilities are proposed: 1. a revised and strengthened League of Nations; 2. expansion and formalization of the United Nations; 3. a new agency combining the best of both; and 4. two agencies, one to prevent war and aggression and the other to deal with all other problems.

Since the volume reviews from various angles the history of international relations during the twentieth century, it is of inestimable value also as a source of current history. A fine index adds to the usefulness of the book as an indispensable reference work.

EDWIN E. AUBREY

Axis Rule in Occupied Europe, by Raphaël Lemkin, New York, Columbia University Press, [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace], 1944, pp. xxviii, 674, $7.50.

This is one of the great books of 1944. It should be read not only by the Allied statesmen but also by all religious leaders interested in the moral and spiritual rehabilitation of Europe. The author is a noted Polish scholar and attorney. He has served with several international juridical committees under the auspices of the League of Nations and has been a member of the faculties of the Free University of Warsaw, the University of Stockholm, and Duke University. Since 1942 he has been head consultant with the Board of Economic Warfare and with the Foreign Economic

Administration. The publication of this book by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace attests to the high merits of the volume.

The book covers the régime established in occupied Europe by Germany and her satellites, such as Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Italy. The analysis of the author is borne out by documents consisting of laws and decrees issued by the military commanders and governors of the Axis powers in the occupied countries. In addition to this documentary description of the régime in each occupied country Dr. Lemkin analyzes the purpose of the Nazi measures and makes proposals for redress in the period after liberation.

"Genocide" is the word used by the author to define the destruction of national and racial groups so largely practiced in this war by Germany. He gives a detailed explanation of the genocide techniques applied by Germany to other nations. He proposes that henceforth genocide be declared an international crime.

In regard to religion Dr. Lemkin through documentary proof shows that the Nazi leaders have had no respect for religion as such but have used it as a political tool. For example, when it has proved politically useful, the Nazis have not hesitated to establish new national church organizations.

The significance of this volume has been aptly stated by Dr. George A. Finch of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He declares that this book because of its basic documents and essential factual information from authentic sources "will be urgently needed when the process starts of untangling the spider web of Axis legislation which has enmeshed the lives and wrecked the fortunes of millions of human beings whose only fault was that they were unable to defend themselves against the modern Juggernaut of total war. It is in this sense that the work is offered as a contribution toward the restoration of peace based upon justice."

PAUL N. GARBER

Daniel Evans: Teacher, Preacher, Theologian, edited by Raymond Calkins, Boston, Pilgrim, ©1944, pp. ix, 236, $2.00.

This is an ideal book of its kind, and will be welcomed by all who were privileged to know the man in whose honor it has been published. Dr. Evans had a long and distinguished career and was widely known in religious and theological circles throughout the country. The preparation of the present volume was a labor of love on the part of Dr. Calkins, for which large numbers will be grateful to him. He has shown excellent taste in the selection and arrangement of his material and has edited it with painstaking care.

Several fitting tributes to Dr. Evans by close friends and associates are incorporated in the book, but they are comparatively brief and together cover only thirty pages. The longest of these is by Frederick H. Page. The main body of the book consists of Dr. Evans' autobiography (pp. 20-145), one of his sermons (pp. 154-166), and two of his addresses (pp. 178-198, 200-227). This method of allowing Dr. Evans to speak for himself seems a wise one, especially in view of the fact that he left no books of his own.

The autobiography is naturally the most interesting part of the book. Written in an engaging style and with ample detail it holds the attention from beginning to end. It is a story of hardship and heroic endeavor, crowned with notable success, a self-revealing document full of human interest. Its author was born in Wales in 1866. In 1869 he came to Pennsylvania with his mother and six older children. His father had preceded the family by a year or two but had been accidentally killed by a falling tree on a farm where he was working. The duty of bringing up this large

family now devolved on the mother. Daniel began work in the coal mines at seven years of age and continued there ten years. At seventeen he decided to secure an education for himself, if possible. He spent a year at Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa., and three years at Bangor Theological Seminary. In 1890 he received the B.A. degree from Bowdoin College, and the next year was devoted to graduate work at Andover Theological Seminary. He served eighteen years as pastor of two Congregational churches, eight years at East Weymouth and ten years in Cambridge, Mass. In 1909 he became professor of Christian theology in Andover Theological Seminary, and held this position until three years after he had passed the official age of retirement.

Dr. Evans was an outstanding leader in the progressive wing of the Congregational ministry; he was "a notable participant in the proceedings which marked the tumultuous period in the life of Andover Seminary from 1918 to 1931"; he contributed numerous articles and book reviews to religious journals: "all of which illustrate," as Dr. Calkins says, "the fertility of his mind, the clear thinking for which he was noted, his scholarship and his passionate devotion to high ideals in theology, in literature and in social problems."

Dr. Evans was an omnivorous reader, "undoubtedly one of the best read theologians of his day." But for this he had to pay a price. No book came from his pen. This has been ascribed to his humility by some and to his devotion to teaching by others. A better explanation, however, seems to me to be this, that he was more interested in broad than in productive scholarship. The latter requires a considerable limitation of the range of one's reading and one's field of study, and this sacrifice of his native interest he preferred not to make. As preacher and teacher he found a broad scholarship more satisfying to himself and of greater practical value.

He left 345 sermons in manuscript. All of these were read by Dr. Calkins, and one on "A Liberal Faith" selected for inclusion in this memorial volume. The two addresses included are entitled "The Meaning and Value of Religion" and "The Ethics of Jesus and the Modern Mind." These three discourses are admirable selections. They illustrate the author's clarity of style and lucidity of thought, and they also bring out some of the basic characteristics of his preaching and teaching, such as, his conservative liberalism, his vital religious faith, and his ethical and social emphasis.

The book as a whole is worthy of the man, and the man in every way worthy of the book.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON

The Silent Billion Speak, by Frank C. Laubach, New York, Friendship Press, ©1943, pp. vi, 201, $1.00.

Among the missionaries aboard the S.S. "Mongolia," sailing from San Francisco early in 1915 for ports in the Orient, was Frank C. Laubach, thirty years of age, under appointment by the Congregational Board for service in the Philippine Islands. He is remembered clearly by the writer of this review as a young man of solid preparation and tolerant attitude, who had chosen to be a pioneer in a field of extraordinary difficulty. He was bound for the large island of Mindanao, at the southern end of the Philippine Archipelago, where the fanatical Moros were not only zealous Moslems but ferocious fighters also. They resisted the American soldiers for at least eight years after the United States had occupied the Philippines, even as they had resisted the Spaniards and Latin Christians since Magellan discovered their land in 1521.

United States army officers warned Laubach not to attempt work immediately

with the Moros, and more than ten years passed before the doors were opened for him. Then the real opportunity came for him through his willingness to learn from the Moslems as well as to share his beliefs with them. He writes: "I did not try immediately to correct their theology. For the time being, I was only too glad they had Jesus beside God, no matter how they got him there."

The young missionary realized he must know more of the Moro language, but not a page of it had even been printed. Besides the Mohammedan priests, who knew some Arabic, the masses of the people were completely illiterate. To reduce even small portions of their vernacular to writing and to teach them enough simple words to enable them to read a few simple sentences was a stupendous task. It would have seemed impossible to one with less faith and energy. But Frank Laubach knew that the minds of the Moros must be opened as they could not be when they could neither read nor write, as was true of nearly all of them.

The missionary, after reducing a comparatively small number of words in the vernacular to writing, with the help of leading Moros, did not begin with the publication of so-called Christian tracts or books. He began with a very simple story paper, in the preparation of which able Moros were glad to have a part. It reported events at Mecca, sketches of famous Moro ancestors, market values of their farm products and necessary imports, and news items. He made friends because obviously he loved the Moros and served them disinterestedly, for the sole purpose of rendering service for the sake of service. He won their complete confidence. In time illiterates learned quickly, through a simple method, to read the simple publications prepared for them. Laubach had discovered a principle that promised much for the enlightenment of the Moros and seemed adaptable for the hundreds of millions of illiterates in other parts of the world.

The Silent Billion Speak is a thrilling story of a great dream, and a remarkable achievement even though in a limited area thus far. It tells how a disinterested attempt to serve a people in darkness led to a discovery of a principle which many believe offers a key for opening the minds of hundreds of millions to new and transforming light, in the Orient and Africa especially. The Moro leaders themselves felt they were pioneers in a liberating movement and that they had a mission to help spread throughout the earth a gospel of literacy. So when Mr. Laubach found it possible to visit other lands at the request of those who had heard of his successful experiment among the Moros, his friends on Mindanao with enthusiasm and affection bade him farewell as an apostle of light to other lands, in a world where three-fifths of the human race can neither read nor write. "In Asia and Africa alone," says Laubach, "over a billion people are illiterate, nine persons out of every ten—half the human race," and he felt that he had hit upon a plan that was practicable for letting at least a little light into hundreds of millions of minds. He went to other islands in the Philippines and spread his plans before influential Filipinos. Then upon invitation of educators, missionaries, and government officials, he went to many centres in India, where eighty-eight per cent of the people are said to be illiterate. Then he proceeded to various sections of Africa, where colonial administrators, educators, and others were interested. Then mission boards in the United States sent him to Latin America. In most centres there was much interest manifested in his simple plans and his dream of having "each one teach one." Then came the global war which has thrown all the world into confusion, and the plan to help the silent billion speak is temporarily delayed, but only temporarily, we hope.

Dr. Laubach's book is more than intensely interesting. In the opinion of this reviewer it is prophetic and points the way in spirit to forms of disinterested mission-

ary activity which need to be pursued in the future, if the largest measure of service is to be rendered.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

Edward Bellamy, by Arthur E. Morgan, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. xvii, 468, $5.00.

Biography is usually thought of in terms of chronology; to abandon that form and write in terms of subjects is a way of emphasizing a point of view. This is the method used by Morgan. He has a case to make out for the author of *Looking Backward,* that amazing analyst of society and prophet of an imagined utopia in the year A.D. 2000. What a short time, indeed, for the complete change of humanity, unless one remembers that "Bellamy was not writing textbooks in science; he was presenting a picture to stir the heart of the common man for a better organization of society" (p. 158).

Bellamy is presented as a precocious youth, observant, studious, and intelligent, who developed a near-messiah complex that might have destroyed him had he not discovered its expression in words. His novels and plans for future writing indicate an imaginative, poetic mind with a determined desire to discover meanings. He was a rebel against restraint in order that he might be assured of the development of his true self under the power of intelligent choice and personal control. Therefore he found himself fighting against the conventional course of love-making and family life, against insincerity, labor as a virtue in itself, fame, money, and social injustice.

Morgan believes that this led Bellamy to analyses of the existing order of society, but "he was not primarily concerned with reforming it" (p. 300). He may not have been, but the resulting Nationalist Movement certainly was: see Chapter XI. And the Theosophical Society cast an appraising and congenial eye upon its latent possibilities, too. Is his essential solution merely an analysis? "We are not bound to a complicated machinery of wages, interest, rents, taxes, and money. The organized community can directly produce what it needs and distribute that production equally among all of its members. There would then be needed no money, no borrowing, no wages, no interest, no rents, no taxes, no private investment capital" (p. 301).

One need go no farther than the preface to discover the kind of biography this is. Here it is stated that "his objectiveness might have made his work even more significant than that of Freud"; he "had a mental life in many respects like that of Emerson"; he "had a sensitiveness to nature scarcely less acute than that of Thoreau"; "Before Bellamy gave up that field [romance and fantasy] he was coming to be Hawthorne's legitimate successor" and while Henry George was a social and economic philospoher and reformer, "In that field the mind of Edward Bellamy has been no less far-reaching, while his grasp of the problem was even fuller and more fundamental, and his program was more comprehensive" (pp. vi-vii). In fact he is "almost a modern Leonardo da Vinci. . . . To do justice to such a personality is far more difficult than to treat of a mind with a single dominant manner or a few modes of expression, as was the case with Emerson, Thoreau, Freud, Hawthorne, or Henry George" (p. viii). And, it may be remarked in passing, also far more difficult to make it plausible.

These rather extended quotations are made with the intent of showing that state of mind into which Morgan has got himself as the result of his ten-year work on the life of Bellamy, aided by the use of papers, manuscripts, and notebooks never before made public. His resulting attitude is further evidenced by his frequent philosophical comments and interpretations upon relatively incidental matters of

Bellamy's life, much as a college president might be expected to do in a chapel talk. (Dr. Morgan is president of Antioch College.)

This is by no means to say that the biography is to be given slight consideration; it will undoubtedly become the basis for any future study of Bellamy's life and contribution. Whatever weakness it has is almost justifiable by reason of the very weight of the new material that has come into the already busy hands and mind of Dr. Morgan. Bellamy becomes a much better known figure than heretofore; future students of the man and his utopia will acknowledge their indebtedness and inspiration.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Emotional Factors in Learning, by Lois Barclay Murphy and Henry Ladd, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. x, 404, $3.50.

Many teachers no doubt cast a wishful glance back to "the good old times" when learning was simple and teaching was easy. Parents, also, have been known to echo the same sentiment! In those times all the teacher had to do was to "give out facts," "develop skills," "impart knowledge," "pass on to the younger generation the wisdom he had accumulated," "pour out impartially upon all pupils the riches of his training and experience." If the pupils would not learn, there was always the hickory stick or the birch rod as a stimulant. If this was ineffective, the child was considered to have "no bent for learning," and was dropped from the school.

Today learning is a complex process and teaching is arduous; we now must "learn our pupils" and we find the problem very difficult. We have learned too much about the workings of the human mind, and about the elements that affect learning to rest easy under the old delusion.

This book by Murphy and Ladd is strongly recommended to those backward-looking persons who wish for "the good old days." It demonstrates vividly and convincingly the fact that learning is not a process of uniform spongelike absorption of material given out by the teacher, but that it is greatly affected and in different ways by conditions outside and inside the learner.

This is one of a series of reports of work done at Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York, under a five-year grant from the General Education Board. The material that forms the basis for this report was taken from a variety of sources and centred upon the educational development through four years of the students in two entering classes. Some data are also given from students who had graduated. All students in each class were studied, even those who did not graduate. Among the sources of data were: 1. thirty full and intensive case studies prepared by a group of teachers, together with analysis of these by the author; 2. weekly records and case reports on fifty students in the exploratory courses; 3. the two-page quarterly reports through four years of about two hundred and fifty students; 4. test data from the American Council Examination, the Allport-Vernon Values Test, and the Bernreuter Personality Inventory; 5. records of destination and plans of those going on leave; 6. infirmary records of each student; 7. stenographically recorded interviews with students graduating from the two classes; and 8. the records, case studies, and notes on special conferences by teachers in the areas of literature and social science. Seminars and conferences with specialists in psychology, psychiatry, and education materially aided in the interpretation of data. This constitutes one of the most thorough and comprehensive studies of groups of college students through four years that has ever been made. The conclusions merit very careful consideration. Although it is a study of women college students, it cannot

fail to have deep significance both for pupils in elementary and secondary schools and for men students in college. As the author states, the study shows the need for careful educational diagnosis as a basis for guidance of personality development, paralleling medical diagnosis as a basis for treatment in the field of physical development. Such diagnosis is almost wholly lacking at present in our colleges.

No brief review can begin to describe the many illuminating observations and stimulating conclusions of this report. It must be read to be appreciated. The eleven case studies reported, each different from the others in pattern of characteristics, add materially to the vividness of the presentation. While space forbids any detailed statement of the points of view presented, a few extracts may serve to indicate the trend of thinking of the author and, we hope, whet the appetite for further reading.

The Purpose of Guidance:

"Our ultimate aim is not to provide ready-made decisions for her, but to help her learn how to solve her own difficulties and how to achieve the security and freedom to live in terms of her own decisions." "While from the outset the college has had a deep respect for the individual as she is, . . . it has grown toward an approach more clearly directed by respect for what the individual may become. . . ." "The criterion, then, is never 'What does she want?' or even, 'Can she take it?' but 'What is our best guess about the direction in which she is heading and what will best help her to achieve progress in the right direction for her?' It is not 'What will be easy for her?' but 'What will make her stretch a bit—grow?' " "The role of the guiding teacher will vary from one student to another but always with this direction—to help the student to feel and think constructively about her experience."

Interests as Guides:

"We have found that interests, whether vocational or avocational, grow from a heterogeneous soil. What you can do well, what you enjoy doing, what you have energy to keep on doing, are all matters separate from each other, yet intimately related. They are important in the development of interests but no more than questions of what you approve of doing, what you think needs to be done." "The relation of interest to the ability to learn is a two-way relation—often it is through the first steps of learning that interest is awakened." "Learning attitudes are related to and dependent upon the type of program offered and the type of teacher who teaches." "The selection of teachers and the selection of courses can both be tailored to the student's present dimensions and expectations of growth." "There is no tidy formula that guarantees growth in all students." "There is no evidence that any one authority pattern in education is good for all students at any given stage of their college work."

Feelings of Insecurity, Fears, Ambitions, etc.:

"Particular health problems are less significant than the role they play in the student's life, and her attitude toward them." "Overt fear and hostility by no means lead to failure; indeed, the contrary is often true." "Being insecure is not as dangerous to intellectual work as being rigid or superficial."

Ways of Individual Development:

"Each student reaches maturity, competence, and self-confidence in a different way, depending on his patterns of intellectual and personal growth. Personal problems—such as health, social life, or family difficulties—may stimulate learning in some students and interfere with it in others. Some students have problems in specific areas of work, while the personality structure of others may affect all areas of their life and work. One student may need concrete material; another may need clear directions; and a third may need freedom from heavy authoritative pressure."

After reading the stimulating and provocative book and after expressing his complete approval and acceptance of the fundamental principles enunciated, the reviewer is left with three questions:

1. Is there not grave danger that such careful and constant study of each student and such frequent conferences will actually produce some of the symptoms and attitudes observed? It seems clear that the authors recognize this danger and attempt to provide against it.

2. Is the therapeutic function of guidance and education completely sufficient? Will a mere freeing of the individual from fears, hostilities, inhibiting complexes, etc., result in growth in the right direction? One remembers the man out of whom was cast seven devils. That was good, but nothing was provided to take the place of the devils. "The last state of that man was worse than the first." More is needed than freeing one from inhibition. What is needed is stimulation and guidance in the right direction. Not infrequently, stimulation to proper growth will in itself free one from blocks to growth.

3. Can colleges and schools provide the type of diagnosis and guidance described in this study? The answer is, of course, No. This inability, however, should not prevent us from keeping in mind the ideal here portrayed and working toward it.

ARTHUR J. JONES

The Development of Higher Education in Mexico, by George I. Sánchez, New York, King's Crown Press, 1944, pp. vii, 140, $1.50.

Professor George Sánchez, of the University of Texas, has here presented a compact, scholarly sketch of the growth of higher education in Mexico against a background of the human, natural, and chronological factors at work through the centuries following the conquest. It is a well-written, engrossing presentation, stressing the interrelation of the cultural scene and the educational program which evolved. Clearly shown are the great contributions of the ardent early religious leaders, the confusion of the middle period, and the baneful influence of the vacillating, constantly changing political leadership of recent years.

The Mexican scene presents a complexity of cultural contacts and influences. The rough topography and the language barrier have prevented a cultural unity of the small number of Spaniards and the large number of Indians from many tribes. The poverty of the land, in agriculture and minerals, has been a great handicap. The culture of Mexico stemmed from the age of absolutism in Spain and developed a social pattern designed under the limitations of mediævalism. The education of Spain, when Mexican universities were founded, was formal and aristocratic, rather than liberal and popular, and learning was scholastic.

The first eighty years of the colony constituted the golden age in the establishment of schools. The first school in the Americas was that founded for the Indian children by Fray Pedro in 1523. The Colegio de Santa Cruz, founded in Mexico City in 1536, has the undisputed distinction of having been not only the first institution of higher learning for Indians, but the first institution of higher learning in the New World. Cortés, after the conquest, displayed a measure of liberal vision and a feeling of social values in converting the Indians and educating Indian leaders to qualify them for posts in the civil government of the colony. By 1636, when Harvard College was founded, the University of Mexico had graduated more than 8,000 students with the baccalaureate degree.

The Jesuits were highly active in the establishment of educational institutions in Mexico from the very outset, many of the schools continuing even after the Jesuits were suppressed in the eighteenth century. The crowning glory of Mexican higher education in the sixteenth century was the founding in 1573 of an endowed residential centre for graduate studies, which from the beginning included many postdoctoral students. Educational endeavor in sixteenth-century New Spain made it plain that

Mexican educational foundations were, in the large, far ahead of their time and, for their time, highly liberal and progressive.

The next two centuries reflected stagnation and decay, and following the war of independence, many institutions closed during the early and middle nineteenth century. When they reopened, many became centres of liberalism and scientific study, especially in medicine and agriculture.

The revolution gave a new outlook to Mexican education, veering away from the traditional limitations inherited from the colonial order. Prior to 1910, education in Mexico was colonial and aristocratic in character, following the humanistic tradition. The nineteenth-century plans for education failed because of financial straits, indecision as to the responsibility for education, and lack of conviction on the part of the privileged as to the necessity for schools. Although schools at all levels have been widely established, the leadership has been weak, for administrative positions have been awarded to political supporters, lacking professional background, with short tenure of office.

Education as a career has been limited to elementary education. Mexico has not had and does not now have secondary or university faculties as they are known in the United States today, nor are the careers of secondary and university teachers recognized as professional. Salary scales are low, and instructors carry about twice the teaching load found in the United States, often in several institutions miles apart, and in narrowly specialized fields. As a result, an educational profession for the teaching of higher learning is virtually nonexistent in Mexico today. There are many other weaknesses which must be overcome before an effective program can be developed.

To anyone interested in a better understanding of Mexican and Latin-American educational problems, in relation to the present cultural pattern, this volume is very illuminating. It will give the general reader a better understanding of the rich and complex cultural heritage of our neighbors to the south.

FRANK R. MOREY

War, Peace, and Nonresistance, by Guy Franklin Hershberger, Scottdale (Pa.), Herald Press, 1944, pp. xv, 415, $2.50.

This carefully written and edited work of Professor Hershberger succeeds in being informative without being particularly enlightening. Chapters five through nine will be valued by students who are interested in the heroic story of the Mennonites, but those portions of the book which deal with nonresistance can only bring disappointment to those readers who are not addicted to biblical literalism.

By the well-worn proof-text method our author proceeds to prove in chapter two that the God of the Old Testament was a god of peace rather than a god of war. He naïvely states, ". . . had they [that is, the people of God] been wholly obedient to God's will the wars and bloodshed of the Old Testament era would no doubt have been avoided." To bolster this thesis Dr. Hershberger points out that when the herdsmen of Abraham and Lot were fomenting strife, Abraham elected the way of love and peace by dividing the land between them. Further, he observes that "when the envious Philistines stopped Isaac's wells, Isaac did not take revenge, but in a Christlike spirit moved on to other grounds." To top off these effective references our author quotes from the book of Exodus the command, "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him

again." The book of Proverbs is also made to serve with the quotation: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat, and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink."

The reader marvels that Dr. Hershberger has not pondered more deeply upon the character of a god whose "peace-loving mind" conceived the Egyptian plagues. Has he forgotten the Jehovah who personally accompanied the Children of Israel in their supposedly triumphant military conquest of Canaan? What about the butchery demanded of Saul by Samuel, or the "Jehovah-blessed" campaigns of David, son of Jesse? Surely Dr. Hershberger does not think he succeeds in making the Jehovah conceived of by the ancient Israelites a god of peace by blandly stating,

> The various Old Testament commands of God requiring killing, such as the commands to slay the Amalekites, to hew Agag to pieces, and to kill the giant Goliath, were permissive commands given to a sinful, lean-souled people who had chosen to live on the lower, "sub-Christian" level. It was God's will that Israel should possess the land of Canaan and since they refused to live the nonresistant way of life in taking it, choosing rather the way that leads to war, He gave the permissive command to take this way.

We must respect the author's conviction that nonresistance is better than bearing arms either aggressively or in self-defense, but it is difficult to respect his method of supporting a thesis by omitting all the scriptural evidence which controverts it.

Chapter three, which purports to deal with nonresistance in the New Testament, is a maze of scriptural quotations which certainly add up to nonresistance as the only alternative open to the "Bible Christian." That another position might be tenable on the basis of scriptures which have not been quoted is brusquely pushed aside by saying, ". . . there are a number of Biblical passages which present some difficulties of interpretation. . . . a full treatment of these various passages would have made the present chapter too lengthy." A somewhat cavalier handling of such passages is therefore postponed to the appendix.

MILTON C. WESTPHAL

BOOK NOTICES

The Psychiatry of Robert Burton, by Bergen Evans (in consultation with George J. Mohr), New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. ix, 129, $2.00.

This is a book on mental illness, written more than three hundred years ago by an Oxford don who himself suffered from the experiences he described. The author of the review is a professor of English at Northwestern University. He is, thus, himself no specialist in psychiatry, but he has made this study in consultation with a well-known psychoanalyst. The result is scholarly and psychiatrically sound. Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy,* as Professor Bergen shows, is a ponderous volume based upon an outworn psychology and a faulty method. His clinical material was small, almost negligible. He depended instead upon a survey of the literature, which included almost all that had been said on the subject in the western world. He brings up masses of testimony to support what is self-evident, and the more recondite the authority, the happier he is. Nevertheless he has given us something more than an erudite compendium. Many of his most valuable observations were drawn from his own experience and intuition. "Other men," he says, "get their knowledge from books, I get mine from melancholizing." And some of his insights are remarkably modern. He thus recognized mental disturbances as exaggeration of normal states and inclined toward psychological rather than somatological explanations. He emphasized the rôle of conscience, the need of love, the emotional basis of distorted imagination, the disastrous effects of inturned aggression, the importance of the patient-therapist relationship, and the requirement that the therapist must first of all rectify the passions and perturbations of his own mind. There are brilliant flashes of insight which come startlingly close to enunciating certain ideas which are now credited to Freud. These flashes are, however, intermittent. They were not part of any balanced whole. Although Burton thus showed remarkable insight, it cannot be claimed that he had any important place in the development of psychiatry. The modern ideas which are in many cases so similar to his own were arrived at independently of him. Dr. Bergen's book is an excellent introduction to a book which is of real interest to the student of human nature and of its aberrations. It tells us how accurately certain psychopathic states had been observed long before the time of modern science and it reminds us that ideas fall on stony ground unless the organized experience of the group is ready to receive them.

ANTON T. BOISEN

Pastoral Work and Personal Counseling, by Russell L. Dicks, New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. x, 230, $2.00.

The tensions inherent in a war period have given added importance to the minister's function as counselor. To pastors anxious for assistance in this field Russell Dicks' new book should be of more than ordinary value. It comes from the pen of a man who has had much experience in the field of counseling and who has had an opportunity to use the knowledge gained through that experience in pastoral work. The reader feels that the author is a master in his field. Being a master, he has no need to parade his theories. They are assumed. Nor does he feel it necessary to display his techniques. Instead, he uses them and shares with the reader the tried and serviceable ones; shares simply and practically their use in

normal pastoral situations. Furthermore, Mr. Dicks shows how a knowledge of the principles of counseling as discovered by psychiatry can be of assistance in pastoral work. He indicates the contribution of an adequate counseling program to the preaching ministry and the educational function of the church. Finally, he understands the limitations of counseling. He realizes that the pastor is not, and should not try to be, a psychiatrist. He indicates what type of cases a pastor should attempt to handle and what he should refer to a professional psychiatrist. In short, the volume is a manual sound in its theory, practical in its approach, and sensible in its treatment. It should find a wide field of usefulness.

JOHN W. THOMAS

Soldiers' Bibles through Three Centuries, by Harold R. Willoughby, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1944, pp. vii, 43, and 16 facsimiles, $1.00.

With his customary diligence and meticulous accuracy Professor Willoughby tells the story of the use of the Bible by soldiers of England and America from 1643, when Cromwell inaugurated the custom with the distribution of a sixteen-page pamphlet of biblical material which, in his judgment, comprised "What a Young Soldier Ought to Know." The story of the subsequent checkered career of this "version," which was reprinted and distributed as recently as World War I by the American Tract Society to the number of 126,000, will be read with interest. Then follows the story of American War Bibles, which begins with the account of the first American-made Bible, that of Robert Aitken, of Philadelphia. This latter, which appeared in 1782, was not only the first but the only Bible to be authorized and approved by Congress. Other features of this interesting monograph are the story of the efforts of the American Bible Society to supply copies of the Bible to the soldiers on both sides during the Civil War, a brief account of the attempt of the Confederacy to provide their own Bibles in consequence of the severe shortage, of the activities of the several Bible Societies during World War I, a bibliography of manuals which "so much as mention the *Souldiers Pocket Bible* of 1643," and a complete facsimile of the *Souldiers Pocket Bible* itself. Not only the general reader but bibliophiles will prize this important chapter in the history of the Bible.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Highroads of the Universe, by J. Glover Johnson, New York, Scribner, 1944, pp. xiv, 316, $2.50.

The chaplain of the Mount Hermon School presents here the results of teaching for eight years the essentials of Christian faith. He has written an eminently readable and helpful volume which may be read with profit by people much older than his classes. His book is scholarly, liberal, and practical. After showing the bearing of science on our thought about the world and human nature, he passes on to "the realm of spirit" and discusses man, Jesus Christ, God, the Bible, worship, the problem of evil, and immortality. The last part of the volume deals with social problems: the place of the individual in society, the church's function, race relations, vocational decision, and world peace. Naturally the treatment is brief, and some questions are consequently much oversimplified. This is especially true of his chapters on Christology and on evil. But the book will be particularly helpful with young people, and might well be used with discussion groups or classes in the churches, or as a textbook for secondary schools.

EDWIN E. AUBREY

The Neo-Idealist Political Theory, by Frederick Philip Harris, New York, King's Crown Press, 1944, pp. ix, 133, $1.50.

The Neo-idealists in British philosophy are the Neo-Hegelians who became important in Britain about 1870. For the ensuing half century their influence was great, their ideas finding their way into the major universities of the British Isles and seeping out into the various parts of the empire. The chief of the Neo-idealists whose ideas form the core of the present volume are Thomas Hill Green, Bernard Bosanquet, J. S. MacKenzie, Sir Henry Jones, D. G. Ritchie, and F. H. Bradley. All of these deal with the common problem of the relation of the individual to the greater society. What is his place? What are his rights? How much should the state aid in the fulfillment of his life? Such are the questions to which answers are sought. The author discovers that in dealing with the problem of self-development, the Neo-idealists reach a common conclusion, though they think towards it along quite different lines. They all assume the reality of the self-governing community. As the individual strives to realize his potentialities within that form of community, they all contend that "it is the business of the community so to manage its organizations and associations that each individual is given an equivalent right to realize them" (p. 46). A government failing in this primary function is regarded as unworthy of the support of reasonable men. The Neo-idealists, however, were too much on the idealistic side of life rather than on its practical side. Their weakness along practical lines was compensated by the more pragmatic utilitarians such as John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham, and Adam Smith, whose earlier philosophy they fulfilled. Having stated this thesis, Mr. Harris proceeds to show that in their theories of the development of the individual and of his relation to others within the social context, the utilitarians, who were the earlier liberals, and the Neo-idealists, who are the later liberals, have much in common. On a third point, which is concerned with the rôle of the government in the development of individuals, they are not so closely united. Here the utilitarians favor *laissez faire* much more than the Neo-idealists, who hold, on the contrary, that the state should regard itself as an instrument to effect the maximum in individual development. The volume contains an extensive bibliography which will help the student in his exploration of political theory in nineteenth- and twentieth-century England.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

The Constant Fire, by Allan Knight Chalmers, New York, Scribner, 1944, pp. ix, 172, $2.00.

In challenging spirit and in language understood of all men in these times, Dr. Chalmers calls people to the excitement of a daring faith in Christ. Sincerely and often painfully conscious of the bewilderment and confusion of mankind in a world of turmoil, he demands that earnest men and women everywhere exercise a stubborn assurance and conviction regarding things eternal. Throughout this stimulating volume we are made keenly conscious of contemporary emphases and insistences, and yet above the evident and realistic we share the joy of the everlasting. Two significant values obtain in these inspiring pages. One is the awareness that the author knows life close-up and lives it keenly. The other is that he has a wholesome, heartening word of encouragement to high-minded belief and to eager service in the things of Christ. The book is clearly not intended as a searching analysis of our troubled hour, though it lacks nothing in reality and genuineness. It is rather a spirited persuasion toward the achievement of spiritual resources competent in this sobering day of destiny. Written in the readily moving style of one to whom the life abounding is

clearly a personal joy, people of all walks of life will find in *The Constant Fire* the light of good horizons rather than the mere dust of the road. The laity, including many of our younger folk, will turn to these pages with real profit. Preachers will, of course, acknowledge their fellowship with Dr. Chalmers in his consecrated earnestness and their indebtedness to him for convincing emphasis upon things of spiritual importance.

IVAN MURRAY ROSE

Costa Rican Life, by John and Mavis Biesanz, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. xiv, 272, $2.75.

I chanced recently upon the quip attributed to the late Shailer Mathews in answer to a query whether he had read a certain book: "We don't read books, we write them." With slight modification this might be applied to the fate of an editor: ". . . we assign them to others." I had intended to do precisely this for the present volume, but could not think of any of our potential reviewers who knew anything about Costa Rica. In consequence, I started to thumb the pages perfunctorily but soon changed pace and read it with distinct and growing interest. It solves no problems, does not attempt to tell experts in other fields how to do their job, does not even try to make the reader a better man (or woman)—in fact, has none of the qualities which lead reviewers, bored to tears by their perusal and at the same time afraid to say so, to end with a good unctious, if ungrammatical: "This is a must book." Thank God, this is not such. I found it of interest since I was totally ignorant of Costa Rica although I did have the vague notion that it was not one of the West Indies. But if Professor and Mrs. Beisanz are truthful souls and at the same time good observers—and I have no slightest reason to question their probity or powers of comprehension—I feel distinctly acquainted with the proud little republic which will certainly be better known to many Americans when the present war is over and the inter-American highway, which runs through the heart of the land, is completed. In fact, I should like to visit it. Apparently it is no comic-opera republic: it has at the present minute four *living* ex-presidents and sometimes has had as high as eight. So far as I know, the United States cannot duplicate either statement. And the term of office for the president is four years, with no possibility for reëlection for another consecutive term. That exhibition of common sense touches a vibrant chord. Again, while women do not vote, and apparently do not want to, all men must vote at each election under penalty of a fine of one dollar or, if they are employees of the government, a month's loss of salary. Its natural isolation from the outside world was not removed until it became engaged in the export of coffee, bananas, and cacoa, which comprises its principle money-making occupation. Costa Ricans are proud of their coffee, and in good American fashion are not afraid to sing its praises: Theirs is, they freely confess, "the best lubricant known to the human machine." It has two railroads, totaling 170 miles, and connecting Limon on the Atlantic side with Pantarenas on the Pacific. Though there has been no considerable immigration to the little state—it is only 23,000 square miles in area—and though it is only tepidly Roman Catholic, its population increased twenty-seven per cent between 1930 and 1940, as against seven per cent in the United States in the same period. Roman Catholicism is the official religion, but the government has never dished out the sugar. There are only 150 priests in the whole country—approximately one to five thousand—in comparison with four hundred lawyers and three thousand teachers. The clergy are unfriendly to the United States, seeing "Yankee Imperialism" behind every banana tree. But the country, as such, is distinctly friendly. Its maidens con the pages of movie magazines and would gladly have American husbands. A common

saying is, "We are Catholics, but not fanatics," and it is evidenced by a greater willingness on the part of Costa Rican boys and girls to marry those of other faiths than is to be seen in the United States. On the other hand, if you are not a Catholic—and are a native—it is good sense not to join any other religion. Protestant missions are given constitutional freedom and are tolerated by the people, but they have made little progress, probably in part because they have frowned upon moderate gambling, bullfighting (in which the bull is in far less danger than the man), drinking, and attendance at movies—all favorite diversions of the Ticos. Government income is derived chiefly from the heavy import and lesser export taxes. Internal business and income taxes (secular papers please copy) are negligible. And the chief source of internal revenue is due to the governmental liquor monopoly. There is much that is attractive about this proud, highly self-respecting little nation. The authors of this instructive volume spent some twenty-one months among the Ticos while Dr. Biesanz was an exchange professor at the University of Costa Rica. Apparently they came to have, even in that limited time, a very distinct understanding of the land and its people. It is homely, unlabored, and objective. It points no morals, does not act as a guidebook or Baedeker, and refrains from painting Costa Rica as either a flowery Eden or gospel-thirsty Sahara. Personally, I think it is well worth the price; but I may be prejudiced since I received it free.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Personal Crisis, by Carl Heath Kopf, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. xi, 164, $2.00.

A popular preacher has gathered together his views on the human side of the cosmic scene under the title of *Personal Crisis.* Some of the problems involved are personal only in the sense that eventually we are each touched by some tributary of the main streams of life. Some of the crises are long-lasting perplexities for which there is no logical solution except the sublimely blind faith of a Job. The book is clearly written, liberal in outlook, and uses effectively the acknowledged results of wide reading. Preachers will find it a rewarding source of material.

WILBOUR E. SAUNDERS

The Way to Freedom, by Meyer Edelbaum, New York, Bloch, 1944, pp. 284, $2.50.

The author has enumerated some of the contributions Jews have made to civilization. These have been important. He has sketched the persecutions his people have suffered in every land in which they have been since the days of Egypt. These have been tragic. He is convinced that any solution save an independent state in Palestine, which he holds to be their right by divine promise to Abraham, by occupation in the long ago, by proven ability, and by Messianic hope, would be suicidal. One wonders. Certain groups thrive only under persecution, and die out, like the Jews in Argentina, under freedom.

I. G. MATTHEWS

Directory of Social Agencies of the City of New York, 1944-1945, New York, compiled by Welfare Council of New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. 366, $4.00.

A complete classification of the social agencies of New York City. The value of the book is enhanced by the fact that all agencies are listed alphabetically and functionally. Under the functional listing a brief account of the work of each agency is presented. This book will be useful to the New York minister who has frequent occasion for referring individuals to social agencies.

JOHN W. THOMAS

BOOKS RECEIVED

**According to Paul,* by Harris Franklin Rall, New York, Scribner, 1944, pp. xv, 272, $2.75.

The Beloved Son, by Blanche Shoemaker Wagstaff, Boston, Bruce Humphries, ©1944, pp. 22 (illustrated), $1.00.

Miss Wagstaff has attempted to set forth for children in chastely rhymed couplets the life of Jesus. The little volume is attractively designed and in addition to a frontispiece (Hoffman's "Christ") is illustrated by Bettie Kerkham.

Points for Emphasis, by Hight C. Moore, Nashville, Broadman, ©1944, pp. 192, $0.40.

A vest pocket commentary on the International Bible Lessons—Uniform Series—for 1945.

**Tempo and Mode in Evolution,* by George Gaylord Simpson, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. xviii, 237, $3.50.

**Earth Might Be Fair,* by Richard S. Emrich, New York, Harper, ©1945, pp. x, 112, $1.50.

**Many Creeds, One Cross,* by Christopher E. Storrs, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. 154, $1.75.

**Sumerian Literary Texts from Nippur in the Museum of the Ancient Orient at Istanbul,* by S. N. Kramer, [The Annual of the American School of Oriental Research, XXIII], New Haven, American Schools of American Research, 1944, pp. viii, 47, 93 plates, $2.50.

**Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work,* edited by Edwin Eells, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. x, 492, $5.00.

Narrow Is the Way, by William E. Park, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. ix, 170, $2.00.

Nineteen sermons by the president of the Northfield Schools, written for and preached to student congregations "made up of young men and women who have not heard too many sermons, whose minds are not closed, and who are still thinking through their own philosophy of life." The author confesses that it was exciting to preach to these congregations. Many a reader of the volume will probably agree that it was definitely worth while, too.

From These Roots, by Mary M. Colum, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944 (second printing), pp. xiii, 386, $2.50.

This is the second edition of a volume presenting the thesis that true criticism precedes and is the inspiration of great literature.

Where Are We In Religion? by Joseph Fort Newton, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. vii, 82, $1.50.

Nine essay-sermons in the familiar style of Dr. Newton, evaluating affiirmatively our present religious opportunity and power.

**Experimental Sociology,* by Ernest Greenwood, New York, King's Crown Press, 1945, pp. xv, 163, $2.25.

**Problems of New Testament Translation,* by Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1945, pp. xix, 215, $2.50.

**The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible,* revised by Henry Snyder Gehman, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1944, pp. xii, 658, and 16 maps, $3.50.

A Bibliography of the Published Writings of Rufus M. Jones, compiled by Nixon Orwin Rush, Waterville (Maine), Colby College Library, 1944, pp. vi, 54, $2.75.

A bibliography of this famous Friend's published works, together with a brief account of his life.

**The Power of Non-Violence,* by Richard B. Gregg, New York, Fellowship Publications, ©1944, 2nd ed., pp. 253, $1.50.

Broadman Comments, by W. R. White, Nashville, Broadman, ©1944, pp. 456, $1.50.

Comments on the International Bible Lessons—Uniform Series—1945.

Song Out of Sorrow, by Felix Doherty, Boston, Bruce Humphries, ©1942, pp. 95, $1.50.

A biographical play in three acts portraying the Catholic poet, Francis Thompson.

**The Preacher's Voice,* by William C. Craig and R. R. Sokolowsky, Columbus, Wartburg Press, ©1945, pp. 132 (illustrated), $2.00.

Rocks of the Ages, by R. C. Campbell, Nashville, Broadman, ©1944, pp. 217, $1.25.

Twelve sermons which "deal with questions of our time in the light of eternity" by the minister of the First Baptist Church, Columbia, S. C.

Your Problem—Can It Be Solved? by Dwight J. Bradley, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. vi, 213, $2.00.

**Meet Amos and Hosea,* by Rolland Emerson Wolfe, New York, Harper, ©1945, pp. xxx, 180, $2.00.

**Advance through Storm,* by Kenneth Scott Latourette, New York, Harper, 1945, pp. xiii, 542, 12 maps, $4.00.

**Babel's Tower,* by Francis Henry Taylor, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 53, $1.00.

**Journal: Second Session of the UNRRA Council,* Washington [New York, Columbia University Press], 1944, pp. 182, $2.00.

* To be reviewed.